3 1761 11970148 0

AR3739




Presented to
The Library
of the
University of Toronto
by
James Stewart, Esq.

Government Publications

CA1 Z1
-55C21

Canada. Royal commission on broadcasting.
Hearings. v. 33-36. 1956.

1957


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/31761119701480

33

# ROYAL COMMISSION

# ON

# BROADCASTING

## HEARINGS

HELD AT

MONTREAL, P.Q. September 14, 1956

v. 33

L-197

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Montreal, September 14, 1956

PRESENT :

| | |
|---|---|
| The Chairman | ROBERT M. FOWLER |
| Commissioner | EDMOND TURCOTTE |
| Commissioner | JAMES STEWART |

---

COMMISSION COUNSEL: JOHN M. COYNE

A.J. deGRANDPRE

SECRETARY:

PAUL PELLETIER

---

Brief submitted by :

LA CONFEDERATION DES TRAVAILLEURS CATHOLIQUES DU CANADA

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen - we will now start and the first brief is from the Confédération des Travailleurs Catholiques du Canada. Mr. Picard, I think you were here yesterday and know of our procedure. The briefs will be received and questions asked in French or English - just as you please. Although unfortunately I have to ask my

questions in English. I understand you in French and so does Mr. Stewart - if you do not speak too rapidly.

We would like you to present the brief as you have seen others do - either by summarizing or reading or both. Just as you choose. After that we will have questions from our counsel and from this commission. I am sorry we kept you so long yesterday and had to carry over to today but that is the sort of thing that happens. We will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit No 193 and you may present it as you wish.

EXHIBIT No 193 : Submission by La Confédération des Travailleurs Catholiques du Canada.

M. GERARD PICARD : Au lieu de donner lecture du mémoire de la CTCC, je crois qu'étant donné que le texte est déjà entre vos mains, qu'il serait suffisant d'en donner un résumé. Avant toutefois de donner un résumé du mémoire, je crois qu'il y a lieu d'identifier notre organisation : mon collègue Gérard Pelletier, directeur des relations extérieures, et moi-Même en qualité de président général, représentons la Confédération des Travailleurs Catholiques du Canada, une organisation fondée en 1921 et qui compte à l'heure actuelle, en chiffres rond, cent mille membres.

Les industries qui y sont représentées

sont à peu près toutes celles qui peuvent être connues dans la Province, et nous avons des syndicats dans environ une soixantaine de centres industriels, et en dehors des industries nous représentons aussi des groupes assez importants dans le commerce et dans les services.

Le mémoire qui vous a été soumis a été, je crois, traduit ou devait être traduit en anglais pour la Commission à la date où nous l'avons présenté. Ce mémoire comprend deux parties. Il y a en premier lieu le mémoire proprement dit qui est suivi d'une requête que nous avions préparée à l'intention des Gouverneurs de Radio-Canada et qui était prête au moment où votre Commission a été nommée; et c'est ce qui explique qu'au lieu de présenter cette requête au Bureau des Gouverneurs nous avons cru qu'il serait préférable de présenter cette requête en même temps que notre mémoire à votre Commission.

Le mémoire lui-même vous indique en premier lieu notre position au sujet de la radio et de la télévision, après quoi et reprenant les divers articles de votre mandat nous tâchons d'expliquer, en regard de chacun de ces articles, notre manière de voir sur les sujets qui y sont indiqués.

La CTCC est d'accord pour que la régie nationale de la radio et de la télévision soit maintenue. Nous croyons que dans un domaine comme celui de la radio et comme dans celui de la télévision, étant donné la nature de ces entreprises et

des buts poursuivis, que ce n'est pas la même chose que s'il s'agissait d'une entreprise industrielle et commerciale; que, au contraire, se trouvent à être reliées à la radio et à la télévision des questions comme la culture, la culture populaire en particulier; que, d'autre part, les programmes généraux qui peuvent être donnés soit à la radio ou à la télévision, spécifiquement le cas de la télévision aujourd'hui, ces programmes contribuent à l'éducation populaire également, et l'on prévoit déjà qu'avant plusieurs années la télévision sera sûrement un auxiliaire précieux pour les systèmes scolaires.

D'autre part, il peut y avoir aussi des raisons de sécurité d'Etat qui peuvent venir s'y rattacher, et à ce moment-là non seulement nous ne sommes pas surpris que le Parlement canadien ait, il y a quelques années, décidé d'avoir non seulement le droit de regard mais le contrôle sur la radio, comme il le fait présentement sur la télévision, nous croyons que c'était vraiment la meilleure formule qui pouvait être adoptée.

Ceci ne veut pas dire que nous croyons que le Bureau des Gouverneurs tel que constitué donne entière satisfaction. Nous ne croyons pas par ailleurs que l'organisation d'une sorte d'administration neutre à côté du Bureau des Gouverneurs marquerait un progrès. Nous sommes opposés à cette idée d'avoir deux ou trois organismes se partageant à première vue

l'autorité; mais nous croyons que ce sera plutôt une source de confusion.

Nous sommes convaincus cependant que les intéressés, les organisations les plus représentatives devraient pouvoir participer d'une manière plus étroite même à la direction de la régie elle-même, si le Bureau des Gouverneurs était lui-même en premier élargi de manière à être plus représentatif. C'est un point que nous soumettons.

Et d'autre part, ce Bureau des Gouverneurs, à notre avis, devrait être appuyé par deux conseils consultatifs, parce qu'étant donné la dualité de culture qu'il y a au Canada, nous sommes d'avis que s'il y avait un comité consultatif de langue française et un comité consultatif de langue anglaise, il pourrait y avoir dans ces deux cas la participation des diverses organisations intéressés, et en tenant compte un peu de la mentalité de chacun des groupes.

Je pense qu'il est reconnu et que c'est de notoriété publique que la mentalité ne peut pas être tout à fait la même dans la manière de penser entre les Canadiens de langue française et les Canadiens de langue anglaise. Ce n'est pas, comme on dit en anglais, "The same frame of mind". Même si, à certains moments les conclusions peuvent être identiques sur un débat qui a lieu; mais je crois qu'il y a

là des raisons suffisantes pour justifier, si l'on doit maintenir cette double culture au Canada, que dans chacun des cas il y ait et la lattitude et les facilités voulues pour pouvoir s'exprimer devant les organismes qui justement ont pour but et de maintenir cette culture et de la développer et de permettre à la population d'y avoir accès.

Je crois que dans le passé, lorsqu'il n'y avait que les systèmes scolaires, on ne peut pas dire que l'ensemble de la population, et notamment les travailleurs, avait vraiment accès à la culture. D'ailleurs, il n'y a qu'à regarder à travers le pays, dans la province de Québec comme ailleurs -- peut-être plus qu'ailleurs -- le pourcentage des enfants qui suivent les cours aux écoles et à quel âge ils abandonnent, pour se rendre compte que vraiment il n'y a pas eu accès à la culture selon les méthodes qui existaient auparavant.

Aujourd'hui, c'est un merveilleux moyen d'éducation, radio et télévision, et nous croyons que pour permettre à la population d'avoir accès à la culture comme nous le désirons, il faut qu'il y ait et cette régie nationale, parce que ça ne peut pas avoir pour but de simplement faire des profits dans un domaine comme celui-là -- c'est pour pouvoir servir la population que ces moyens sont inventés; et la population, je crois, sera parfaitement d'accord si l'on trouve les moyens et

de rendre plus accessible la culture au peuple lui-même et de constituer les organismes qui sont nécessaires pour permettre une meilleure compréhension entre la direction, par exemple, de Radio-Canada et les organismes qui représentent un secteur ou l'autre de la population et la population elle-même.

Nous en profitons dans notre mémoire pour indiquer que naturellement ça suppose qu'il y ait un budget et un budget suffisant entre les mains de la régie d'Etat si l'on veut arriver à obtenir les résultats que nous suggérons.

A l'heure actuelle et d'après les chiffres que nous avons pu recueillir de source officielle, il semble bien que c'est un budget d'environ trente millions qui représente les dépenses de la régie en matière de télévision et, d'autre part, que les mêmes sources officielles nous indiquent que ce budget devrait être approximativement de cinquante millions de dollars. Sans doute qu'une enquête pourrait indiquer s'il y a quelques item qui modifieraient ce chiffre, mais il nous paraît avoir été établi sérieusement.

D'autre part, il est peut-être difficile pour la régie d'Etat de progresser beaucoup si elle n'est vraiment assurée de son budget. Si chaque année elle ne sait pas quel est le montant qui sera disponible pour elle, il sera bien difficile pour elle d'essayer d'envisager un programme

d'assez longue haleine sur une période de...
Ainsi, à l'heure actuelle, pour prendre un des éléments de la question qui est déjà dans la discussion publique, il n'y a aucun doute que la télévision en couleurs deviendra une réalité un de ces jours.

Par ailleurs si la régie elle-même n'a que tout juste ce qu'il lui faut pour vivre ou est exposée chaque année à des déficits, il lui devient à peu près impossible, tout en sachant comme nous tous que cette amélioration va surgir un de ces moments, il lui sera à peu près impossible de tracer un programme sur une période de ... pour arriver à cette réalisation.

Nous ne savons pas quels seraient les différents moyens possibles d'arriver à ce résultat d'un budget déterminé, connu à l'avance et pour plusieurs années, mais une suggestion qui a été discutée par notre organisation et que j'ai l'honneur de soumettre à votre Commission, est en relation avec un octroi statutaire d'une part, c'est-à-dire un montant déterminé voté par le Parlement et qui serait basé sur le nombre d'appareils de télévision au Canada.

Il peut y avoir d'autres moyens également pratiques d'arriver à ce résultat, mais celui que nous suggérons nous a frappés au moins dans le sens suivant: c'est que le nombre d'appa-

reils qu'il peut y avoir au Canada est certainement un indice du nombre de foyers qui s'occupent de télévision.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not necessarily a direct relationship between the two. As Mr. Stewart asked one of the witnesses yesterday, if you had another 50 thousand sets in Montreal tomorrow - you would not have 25 per cent more cost in your service but you say there is some relationship to the number of sets?

M. PICARD: Ce n'est pas absolu. Il y a une chose certaine: c'est que ça peut permettre de déterminer ce que ça peut représenter par appareil ou par foyer, selon un budget de... Si, par exemple, la conclusion - pour ne prendre un chiffre que pour fins de discussion - était qu'il est nécessaire à l'heure actuelle qu'il y ait un budget de 50 millions de dollars par année à la disposition de la régie de la télévision, ça peut vouloir dire qu'en pratique ça représenterait près de $21. par appareil, au Canada, à l'heure actuelle.

M. TURCOTTE: Ne faudrait-il pas baser cet octroi statutaire sur le nombre d'heures de programmes dans une semaine ou dans un mois, puisqu'en somme il coûte aussi cher de faire un programme d'une heure pour dix personnes que pour 100,000 personnes dans la même région?

L-206

M. PICARD: Voici, monsieur le commissaire: remarquez bien que si nous connaissions le nombre d'heures où il y aura programme et non pas prendre comme base le nombre d'heures connu présentement, parce que ça pourrait empêcher également de progresser si l'on s'arrêtait aux heures actuelles des programmes. S'il s'agit de remplir suffisamment de temps pour qu'il y ait tous les programmes qui sont nécessaires, que ce soient des programmes de culture ou d'agrément, là, il se peut que ça puisse être une base; mais je ne vois pas très bien comment le lien pourrait être fait entre le nombre d'heures et le budget lui-même. C'est une question que nous n'avons pas examinée de très près, mais je ne vois pas très bien comment sur le nombre d'heures il pourrait y avoir...

M. GERARD PELLETIER: Il y a un certain danger à ce moment-là aussi d'arriver dans un domaine où c'est particulièrement dangereux à compter avec la quantité plutôt qu'avec la qualité.

THE CHAIRMAN: You don't mind us interrupting you as you go along occasionally.

M. PICARD: That's allright. De cette façon, l'idée générale c'est que Radio-Canada pour nous doit avoir un budget certain, connu non seulement pour une année mais pour plusieurs années selon un octroi statutaire. L'une des formules que nous suggérons pourra être examinée mais naturelle-

ment nous ne fermons pas la porte à aucune autre des suggestions qui permettraient d'arriver à un résultat concret.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you say "certain" you mean either certain or capable of being reasonably certain.

MR. PICARD: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do not mean it must be necessarily a fixed dollar amount, you say it must be capable of being calculated reasonably closely.

M. PICARD: Certainement, monsieur le président; je crois un peu comme les prévisions budgétaires dans n'importe quel domaine, il y a toujours un peu en plus ou en moins sur le total.

Quant au mandat de votre Commission, je crois que le mémoire parle par lui-même sur chacun des points et qu'il n'y a pas lieu d'insister; mais vous remarquerez que pour ce qui a trait aux postes privés, nous en faisons une critique assez sévère et ceci provient de l'expérience que nous avons eue avec ces postes, des difficultés que nous avons rencontrées; non seulement d'une censure sévère à certain moment mais d'un véritable boycottage des organisations syndicales. Je ne dirai pas dans ce domaine non plus que j'y mets un absolu.

L-208

Il y a un poste qui était ici hier après-midi, le poste CKAC, et je dois dire qu'il représente une exception en relation avec ce que je viens d'exposer, parce qu'avec la direction de CKAC à la radio nous n'avons pas eu de difficultés sérieuses avec eux; mais d'une manière générale c'est ce qui est arrivé.

Et en réalité, je crois que votre Commission est déjà au courant que dans plusieurs régions de la province, là où les postes sont sous contrôle d'individus ou de compagnies,avec un moyen aussi important dans le domaine de la culture et de l'éducation, c'est assez vexant qu'au moins un certain nombre d'entre eux qui peuvent avoir leur compétence par ailleurs dans d'autres domaines, n'ont généralement pas manifesté qu'ils en avaient beaucoup dans le domaine de la radio, et je présume qu'ils n'en démontreront pas davantage dans le domaine de la télévision, parce qu'il y a trop cette tendance non pas d'éclairer l'opinion publique, non pas de lui permettre d'avoir accès à la culture, mais de l'influencer dans une direction ou dans une autre et généralement sinon strictement en relation avec des problèmes de politique locale.

Parfois ça va plus loin, mais le plus souvent c'est en relation avec la politique et c'est en relation avec la pensée de celui qui est là et non pas en relation avec l'intérêt public.

L-209

Alors, comme du point de vue démocratique nous nous rendons compte qu'il est très difficile d'avoir la moindre influence sur ces postes; de par ailleurs, même s'il y a du côté de Radio-Canada des points sur lesquels nous aimerions ou faire des suggestions ou des déficiences que nous aimerions voir corriger, nous nous rendons compte qu'il y a plus de facilité pour nous de faire la discussion avec d'abord la Régie elle-même, et il y a toujours ce recours en régime démocratique que si ça ne va pas pendant trop longtemps, eh bien, il y aura des chances que ça change un de ces jours.

La requête qui porte sur la liberté de parole indique aussi comment, en relation avec certains de ces postes, nous avons eu des difficultés. Nous croyons qu'il y a lieu d'examiner cette question-là au point de vue censure, non pas que nous désirions que tout représentant d'une organisation syndicale puisse arriver à un poste avec un texte préparé et dire:"C'est ce texte que nous désirons passer et la liberté de parole exige que nous le passions tel que rédigé". Nous savons très bien que dans ce domaine comme dans le domaine de la presse, il peut y avoir à certain moment danger de libel et de diffamation et il est nécessaire que quelqu'un voit, lorsque les règlements sont adoptés, à ce qu'ils soient appliqués. Nous ne voyons pas que ces règlements devraient être appliqués autrement que par l'intermédiaire de la

L-210

Régie, surtout de la manière que nous suggérons qu'elle soit constituée, avec des conseils consultatifs qui pourraient peut-être nuancer davantage un certain nombre de règlements avec lesquels nous avons été aux prises nous-mêmes.

Ainsi, lorsqu'il n'y a aucune période de temps accordée aux organisations syndicales, même en dehors de toute période de conflit, ceci veut dire qu'il y a quand même un secteur de la population aujourd'hui qui est assez important -- nous n'en représentons en somme que cent mille -- mais il y a tout de même un million de travailleurs qui sont d'une manière ou d'une autre familiés avec les organisations syndicales, et il est important pour eux qu'ils puissent, par l'intermédiaire de la radio et de la télévision, qu'ils puissent obtenir là un certain nombre de renseignements; et ça nous paraît être un sujet aussi important que les prix des marchés agricoles.

Sans doute que s'il y a conflit, c'est peut-être plus délicat; mais n'empêche qu'à l'heure actuelle, si, par exemple, à un programme comme aux "Affaires de l'Etat", un homme publique, lui, parce qu'il a cette facilité, choisit un sujet contentieux et attaque pendant cette période-là les organisations syndicales ou l'une d'entre elles, eh bien, il devrait y avoir facilité pour l'organisation syndicale, en payant au moins, d'aller riposter.

L-211

Et à l'heure actuelle les règlements ne paraissent pas être trop généreux sur ce point. Alors nous n'avons pas d'objection à éviter qu'il y ait controverse continuelle à la radio ou à la télévision; nous savons très bien que ce n'est pas le principal but, mais quand même il y a au point de vue de la liberté d'expression quelque chose qui devrait, à notre avis, être revu.

Je crois, monsieur le président, qu'il y a peut-être un point que je pourrais mentionner en terminant: c'est celui où il est déjà facile de prévoir qu'avec les régimes d'automation qui s'en viennent, dans la population il y aura sûrement plus de loisirs parce que c'est déjà prévisible qu'il y aura encore, je ne sais pas à quelle date exactement, mais il y aura encore réduction des semaines de travail et des heures de travail. Au fur et à mesure que la productivité elle-même, en relation avec l'automation, va permettre d'avoir une capacité de production suffisante qui n'exigera pas même quarante heures par semaine.

Alors, les loisirs qui posent un problème à l'heure actuelle parce que déjà on se demande ce qui adviendra -- nous, nous n'avons pas de crainte particulière -- en dehors du monde ouvrier on craint que les travailleurs fassent simplement de la paresse lorsqu'ils auront terminé leur semaine régulière de travail. Nous n'avons aucune crainte

à ce sujet, s'ils ont les moyens voulus à leur disposition pour participer à la culture générale.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is an interesting point, I do not think we have had that before, Mr. Picard.

M. PICARD: Je vous remercie, monsieur le président et messieurs les commissaires.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your presentation and also for the great amount of work and thought that has gone into your brief. I am not expressing any opinion on thestatements made in the brief, but merely on the care with which you have studied the question and presented it in so clear a way.

Mr. deGrandpré, have you some questions?

Me deGRANDPRE: Monsieur Picard, nous sommes en face d'un problème un peu difficile, parce que nous avons reçu à l'heure actuelle des représentations de divers groupes ouvriers: le Canadian Labor Congress a comparu devant nous; nous avons eu également des représentations multiples de groupes de fermiers. Vous comparaissez aujourd'hui devant nous et si on additionne mathématiquement le nombre de personnes que, par exemple, ces trois seuls groupes représentent, nous dépassons le million et de beaucoup; et ces trois groupes que je viens de mentionner ont adopté une attitude à peu près identique

à la vôtre dans leurs mémoires: une seule régie, un médium de culture qui devrait être poussé encore plus avant, etc.

D'un autre côté, nous avons entendu les représentations de certains propriétaires de postes ou d'autres organisations de sondage, qui viennent nous dire que ce ne sont pas les postes de Radio-Canada qui sont écoutés mais que ce sont plutôt les postes privés qui, d'après votre groupe et les groupes semblables, représentent ce qu'il y a de culturel dans les émissions. Alors, jusqu'à quel point pouvons-nous départager ces deux points de vue?

M. PICARD: Je crois que monsieur Pelletier pourrait sur ce point donner une réponse.

M. GERARD PELLETIER: Je crois que si vous parlez pour la région et le public de notre région, j'aimerais avoir des précisions sur les représentations qu'on vous a faites et les affirmations qu'on vous aurait faites que les postes de télévision privés sont écoutés davantage.

Me deGRANDPRE: A Montréal, c'est difficile pour le public de langue française, mais l'expérience est acquise je crois plutôt à la radio.

M. PELLETIER: Est-ce que vous avez reçu des considérations à la télévision, pour éliminer ce point-là, qui favoriseraient, par exemple, pour l'écoute massive et le contentement des auditeurs

des postes privés de Québec, de Chicoutimi et Rimouski par rapport aux émissions télévisées de Radio-Canada?

Me deGRANDPRE: Je n'ai pas de chiffres sur ces postes en particulier, mais je peux vous dire que, par exemple, on nous a indiqué dans un poste comme Toronto où ils ont un choix, par exemple, entre les postes américains d'une part qui leur arrivent de Buffalo et le poste de Radio-Canada, que ça irait même jusqu'à une proportion de 70 à 72 pour cent, si mes chiffres sont exacts, environ, en faveur des postes privés tandis qu'à peine 30 pour cent écouteraient les postes de Radio-Canada. Je me demande jusqu'à quel point la masse ouvrière ou d'agriculteurs se tourne vers les programmes culturels de Radio-Canada ou ce qu'il est convenu d'appeler un programme plus culturel, si vous voulez, plus éducatif.

M. PELLETIER: Si vous permettez, je rendrai bien clair un fait ici: c'est que quand nous parlons de culture populaire aux termes de ce mémoire, nous n'entendons pas les programmes de culture avec un C majuscule tels qu'on les entend d'habitude.

Me deGRANDPRE: Ce n'est pas ma question.

M. PELLETIER: Nous sommes d'avis que toute la radio et que toute la télévision est

culturelle, c'est-à-dire que toute émission télévisée ou radiodiffusée a une influence directe sur la culture, et quand nous parlons d'émissions culturelles nous parlons tout aussi bien d'émissions de divertissement, parce que nous ne croyons pas que ça puisse se séparer. Nous croyons que la séparation est arbitraire. C'est pour ça, par exemple, que nous nous objectons à ce qu'on dise :"Radio-Canada va s'occuper de la culture, ça va être son domaine personnel et les autres vont s'occuper d'autre chose". L'autre chose pour eux n'existe pas. La télévision est une force qui agit sur la culture, qu'on mette ce qu'on veut sur les écrans. De sorte qu'à partir du moment où vous travaillez dans ce cadre de référence il est difficile de répondre à votre question.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je parle des programmes de Radio-Canada dans leur ensemble; des représentations qu'on a eues par certains groupes ont démontré que Radio-Canada comme centre de diffusion de programmes n'était pas écoutée et que le pays engouffrait des millions alors qu'on n'en retirait pas tout le profit qu'on s'attendait d'en retirer.

M. PICARD: Si vous me permettez, je serais porté à faire l'observation suivante: c'est que depuis les débuts de la télévision, si j'en juge par chez moi, parce que je n'ai pas de statistiques sur l'ensemble des postes -- Aux heures où la

famille pouvait être aux écoutes du poste de radio de Radio-Canada, ce sont des heures où aujourd'hui il y a des programmes de télévision, où elle passera plutôt à la télévision. Ca ne veut pas dire qu'elle va aller à un autre poste de radio.

Maintenant, dans les régions elles-mêmes, ça me paraît absolument plausible qu'aux heures vides et même à des heures qui peuvent être remplies par d'autres programmes, qu'il y ait des gens quand même à l'écoute, mais là la nature même du programme pourra influencer aussi pour les amener à l'écoute, et ça pourrait être vrai pour des programmes autant de la région que des programmes de Radio-Canada; je pense que c'est assez naturel .

Mais lorsqu'il s'agit de l'organisation même de la télévision et au fur et à mesure que les programmes eux-mêmes auront pour l'ensemble encore plus d'intérêt qu'ils en ont, il n'y aura plus, je crois, le choix exclusif d'un ou deux programmes parce qu'il est connu d'avance qu'il y aura tel sujet. Ca peut être un simple quizz, ça peut être une conférence de presse, ça peut être aussi le téléthéâtre, ça peut être de la musique d'orchestre, enfin, tous ces programmes-là vont se distribuer sur la population, tout le monde n'ayant pas exactement les mêmes goûts. Il peut y en avoir qui suivent avec grand intérêt un programme de lutte et puis il y en a d'autres que ça

n'intéresse pas du tout. Alors, ils reviendront peut-être simplement au poste lorsque la lutte sera terminée. Et pendant cette période-là c'est peut-être un autre poste qu'ils écouteront.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je pense que je n'ai peut-être pas clarifié suffisamment ma question, parce qu'on n'a pas l'air à se comprendre. Les données que je vous ai indiquées tout à l'heure, ces pourcentages indiquant que les postes privés sont écoutés plus que dans une proportion du double en regard des postes de Radio-Canada sont des proportions de moyennes, si vous voulez. Il est clair que pendant la lutte, par exemple, vous aurez une plus grande proportion de gens qui regarderont la lutte; mais ça prouverait précisément le point des postes privés que si le programme de lutte est écouté c'est que la radio privée pourrait aussi bien le donner sans qu'il en coûte un seul sou à la nation.

M. PELLETIER: Voici, je voudrais d'abord, sans être capable de produire de documents là-dessus, contester certains des résultats de ces cotes, de ces agences de sondage d'opinion. Je voudrais les contester pour une raison très simple mais qui vous fera impression je pense bien. On a remarqué qu'un très haut pourcentage de ces cotes montaient aussitôt que le programme était commandité. Je n'ai jamais pu me faire à l'idée que l'addition d'un commercial à un programme dont l'essence n'était pas changé pouvait attirer le public, et ça m'a toujours rendu certaines de ces cotes

assez suspectes.

Deuxième question: je crois que, en radio en particulier, il y a un certain nombre de moyens et qui, sans être tout à fait illégaux sont, à mon esprit et à l'esprit de beaucoup de gens, assez peu honnêtes pour attirer l'auditoire. Et par exemple, si vous êtes un auditeur de radio, vous savez que les postes commerciaux ne se sont jamais abstenus d'aucune formule même quand ça frisait certains articles du code criminel comme sur le jeu, par exemple, ou le hasard ou la lot erie, mais ne se sont jamais abstenus, sauf quand ils étaient forcés de le faire, de certains moyens, n'ont jamais poussé le respect de l'auditeur jusqu'à faire un régime, une diète équilibrée pour leur esprit.

Et par exemple, je pense que dans la classe ouvrière en particulier, quand vous faites des concours qui n'apportent absolument rien sauf ce que peut apporter un bingo ou que ce que peut apporter une loterie, eh bien, il est malhonnête vis-à-vis la population, à notre avis, de la tenir rivée à une émission de radio parce que la cagnotte était hier de cinq cents dollars, aujourd'hui de mille, demain de mille cinq cents et dans deux semaines ça ira jusqu'à quatre ou cinq mille dollars. Malgré la puissance du syndicalisme les augmentations de salaire ne rapportent pas des montants aussi considérables, n'est-ce pas, et moi j'ai souvent causé dans des instituts d'éducation avec des ouvriers

qui, eux, déploraient ces émissions, qui tenaient leur femme, par exemple, à la maison, dans un état de nervosité et d'excitation absolument extraordinaire.

Et quand vous regardez l'horaire des postes privés et que vous avez de ces émissions malhonnêtes au sens que je viens de vous dire, qui relaient l'horaire depuis le matin jusqu'au soir, vous comprenez que les gens restent à l'écoute de ce poste-là, que ça les intéresse ou non; mais je pense que là on est complètement sorti du domaine de la culture ou plutôt on y est mais pas pour faire l'éloge de cette suite de programmation.

Me deGRANDPRE: Alors, la réponse à ma question serait que vous demanderiez un plus grand contrôle de cette façon d'annoncer les programmes ou de tenir l'auditeur en éveil et en suspens?

M. PELLETIER: Certainement.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, dans un domaine qui est un peu connexe, est-ce que vous seriez en faveur de campagnes de publicité par Radio-Canada pour porter à l'attention du public certains programmes de valeur? On nous a fait remarquer que, par exemple, certains programmes de sport étaient annoncés à quart de page dans les quotidiens et dans les hebdomadaires, et que d'un autre côté jamais ou à peu près jamais Radio-Canada ne se permettait de

porter à l'attention du public un programme de valeur. Est-ce que dans le même ordre d'idée mais à l'opposé, votre groupe, votre syndicat serait en faveur que Radio-Canada dépense des deniers publics pour porter ces programmes de valeur à l'attention du public?

M. PELLETIER: Nous sommes favorables à des solutions de ce type-là dont le détail, évidemment, est difficile à fixer parce que précisément nous croyons que la radio, contrairement à certaine propagande qu'on fait, doit répondre aux besoins du public, bien sûr; mais il n'est pas certain que le public connaisse spontanément même ses besoins profonds; et je pense que dans toute la vie sociale il y a de nombreux exemples: l'école obligatoire, par exemple, s'il y a un besoin fondamental, c'est bien que l'enfant reste à l'école jusqu'à 14, 15 ans, ce qui n'a empêché aucune société de rendre la fréquentation scolaire obligatoire parce qu'on savait qu'il y avait toutes sortes de facteurs qui pouvaient intervenir et empêcher les familles, surtout les familles moins fortunées, de comprendre cette nécessité et surtout d'être capables d'y faire face.

Alors, nous croyons que la radio a certainement le devoir d'estimer les besoins du public, non pas d'en décider à sa place,-ce qui n'est pas la même chose - froidement, et d'essayer d'y répondre, et je crois que la publicité de bonnes

émissions serait en effet une chose indiquée, en notant toutefois que le public quand il n'est pas sollicité par ailleurs, je dirais malhonnêtement au sens de ma réponse de tout à l'heure, sait les trouver lui-même très souvent; par exemple, que la population, même ouvrière, a pris goût à des émissions culturelles même avec un C majuscule, comme le Téléthéâtre; c'est une chose indiscutable. Il suffisait d'être dans les usines ou dans des réunions d'ouvriers le lendemain ou le surlendemain pour nous rendre compte que c'était devenu une institution, qu'on achetait trois bouteilles de bière de plus, qu'on invitait le voisin et qu'on se réunissait pour le Téléthéâtre qui était souvent d'un choix assez élevé.

Me deGRANDPRE: Alors, est-ce que vous verriez un élément de solution tout simplement en empêchant les postes privés de faire une publicité tapageuse autour de leurs programmes au lieu de faire dépenser de l'argent à Radio-Canada pour contrebalancer la publicité tapageuse des postes privés?

M. PELLETIER: Je ne crois pas que ce soit une question de publicité tapageuse ce qu'on discute là. C'est surtout une question de procédure. Il y a cette question qui passait hier devant la Commission, à savoir que les postes soient concédés ou pas concédés à des gens qui possèdent un journal. Evidemment, quand on dispose d'un quotidien avec 300,000 de tirage pour faire

la publicité si bien que ça, même si on fait un petit tapage, ils ont droit; et il y a ce handicap du côté de Radio-Canada; mais je crois que c'est plutôt, sans toucher du tout à la liberté de parole ou la liberté d'opinion qui, pour nous est sacrée, bien sûr, d'un contrôle de la qualité et surtout de l'équilibre des diètes de radio et de la télévision, si vous voulez.

Ce n'est pas d'empêcher un poste de faire telle chose mais d'empêcher un poste de ne faire que telle chose et d'en abrutir le public. Je choisissais l'exemple des programmes où on donne des sommes d'argent fantastiques ou toutes sortes de choses du même genre. Il ne s'agit pas de supprimer ces programmes-là de l'horaire, pas plus qu'il s'agit de supprimer la botanique du programme scolaire. Seulement, on tolérerait mal que nos enfants aillent à l'école pendant dix ans pour apprendre seulement la botanique.

M. TURCOTTE : Pratiquement parlant, comment concevez-vous cette publicité que Radio-Canada pourrait faire de ses propres programmes? A la radio même ou à la télévision même ou sous forme de communiqués de presse ou de publications adressées au public ou sous forme de peut-être un programme de dix minutes chaque jour, annonçant les programmes de la soirée et expliquant brièvement en quoi ils consistent pour tâcher d'intéresser le public à ce qui va venir? Avez-vous des idées pratiques, con-

crètes, dans ce domaine-là?

M. PELLETIER: Je crois que tous ces moyens-là sont bons. La seule remarque utile, je pense bien, qu'on pourrait faire là-dessus -- parce qu'on n'a pas étudié le problème de façon particulière -- ce serait que Radio-Canada doit s'arranger pour sortir de son propre auditoire. Par définition, quand on veut attrapper des auditeurs nouveaux il ne faut pas s'adresser à ceux qu'on a déjà, et je crois qu'en particulier l'utilisation des journaux serait une excellente chose, parce que les journaux sont la propriété très souvent de postes qui, eux-mêmes, ont -- je m'excuse de l'expression -- leur propre salade à vendre et qui sont un peu moins zélés pour vendre celle du voisin. Je crois que c'est la seule remarque utile, parce qu'on n'a pas étudié le problème sous cet angle-là.

M. TURCOTTE: Qu'elle achète de la publicité commerciale et la paie? C'est une charge supplémentaire dans ce cas-là.

M. PELLETIER: D'après l'expérience qu'on a, nous, avec les journaux, il faudrait qu'ils la paient, je pense bien.

M. TURCOTTE: C'est une charge supplémentaire qui, à la fin de l'année, pourrait représenter un budget assez considérable, d'autant plus qu'il faudrait le faire dans le pays tout

entier et non pas seulement dans une ville en particulier.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous ne préconisez aucun changement dans la structure de notre système de radiodiffusion. En somme, vous pensez toujours comme on pensait vers 1932 ou 1934, à la période de l'évolution du système. Croyez-vous qu'à l'heure actuelle c'est une pensée réaliste de vouloir rester au point où nous en étions en 1932 alors que nous étions en pleine crise et ne croyez-vous pas qu'il y aurait avantage à ce que la Radio d'Etat se développe dans un sens et que la radio privée se développe dans l'autre?

M. PICARD: Il me semble qu'il n'y a rien dans notre mémoire qui indiquerait que nous ne désirons pas participer au progrès. Lorsque, par exemple, sur les organismes mêmes qui doivent être mêlés et à la consultation auprès de Radio-Canada nous suggérons des changements, c'est parce que nous croyons que l'ensemble des organisations représentatives et intéressées dans un domaine ou dans les domaines comme ceux de la radio et de la télévision, si elles y sont, que c'est encore là que ceux qui ont vraiment et des idées nouvelles et des suggestions nouvelles en vue de faire marquer un nouveau progrès pourront les exprimer, parce que ce qui nous paraîtrait être un recul ce serait de supprimer la régie d'Etat parce que ç'a déjà

existé avant.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je ne parle pas de supprimer la régie d'Etat, je parle d'un système d'Etat et d'un système privé qui seraient en parallèle. La raison pour laquelle, vers la période 1932 on a décidé de se servir de ce système mixte d'une radio d'Etat avec des débouchés privés c'était que le coût était trop élevé pour les ressources de la nation à ce moment-là. Croyez-vous que les mêmes raisons sont encore valables en 1956, au Canada, alors que nos ressources ont été développées par je ne sais pas combien de fois depuis 25 ans?

M. PELLETIER: Si vous remarquez, ce n'est pas exactement dans la perspective où nous pensons à ce problème-là -- ce n'est pas pour nous river au mémoire que je réponds ça -- mais ce n'est pas exactement dans cette perspective-là que nous étudions le problème. Si nous avons fait ce grand topo au début du mémoire pour montrer que la télévision était une chose qui dépassait certaines objections qu'on lui faisait, c'était un peu pour nous déprendre de ce type d'objection. Ce n'est pas, par exemple, pour dire les choses nettement, parce qu'un monsieur possède cinq millions de dollars que nous croyons ce monsieur accréditable à posséder ou à diffuser sur un poste de télévision. Ce n'est pas du tout dans cette perspective-là que nous travaillons. De sorte

que le nombre de messieurs prospères qui pourraient ouvrir des postes de télévision, ça nous importe assez peu.

Et quant à être du même avis où nous étions en 1932, c'est qu'au fond, ce qui nous réjouit de la façon dont la radio a été organisée en 1932, c'est le caractère démocratique et le caractère de responsabilité vis-à-vis la nation qui a marqué la formation de Radio-Canada et ça, comme la démocratie, ça ne nous paraît pas démodé encore. Et comme nous avons fait l'expérience d'un certain nombre d'autres commissions administratives qui, elles, n'étaient pas démocratiques, ça nous approfondit dans l'estime que nous avons pour celle-là, avec les réserves, bien entendu, que fait notre mémoire. Nous ne sommes pas non plus entièrement satisfaits de ce qui se passe.

Mais dans la perspective où nous considérons la télévision, nous croyons que le principe de responsabilité, de responsabilité à la nation, en matière de radio et de télévision devrait être intangible, et nous ne voyons pas plus le développement de la radio et de la télévision selon le mode de l'entreprise privée orientée vers le profit que nous ne pourrions voir un secteur important de notre système scolaire orienté vers l'entreprise privée avec comme but le profit. C'est de cet ordre-là l'importance de la

télévision, dans la perspective où nous sommes placés

Me deGRANDPRE: Ce que j'avais particulièrement en vue c'était qu'un système d'Etat couvre toute la nation et produise des programmes qu'on va appeler culturels avec un petit c, si vous voulez, et qu'on donne une chance aux postes privés, en parallèle de ça, pas à l'exclusion de l'Etat, absolument en parallèle, de se développer selon les principes de liberté d'entreprise et de démocratie dont vous venez de parler.

M. PICARD: A la rigueur ce que vous mentionnez, ça paraît applicable, à la rigueur; mais ça conduit à aller chercher comme exemple des comparaisons que nous sommes à peu près dans l'obligation d'écarter après les avoir examinées.

En réalité, lorsqu'on parle des deux secteurs, généralement, on va penser "Est-ce qu'il existe certains postes privés par rapport à la radio d'Etat", on va penser au C.N.R. par rapport au C.P.R.; on va penser à toute une série d'expressions, de formules qui ont été ou sont encore en vigueur dans divers domaines à l'heure actuelle; mais comme mon collègue vous l'a mentionné, c'est que dans ce domaine-là nous ne croyons pas que les mêmes raisonnements puissent s'appliquer à cause justement de cette responsabilité envers la nation qui est fondamentale quant

à nous. Et à partir de là il est bien difficile de continuer le raisonnement pour savoir si dans l'application d'un principe comme celui-là il peut y avoir tout un réseau de postes privés sans responsabilité, en somme, envers la nation.

Me deGRANDPRE: Si vous aviez au-dessus de ces deux organismes, l'un d'État et l'autre privé, une commission d'ensemble qui verrait à sauvegarder les principes que vous voulez sauvegarder dans la radio privée comme dans la radio d'État, est-ce que vous y verriez objection?

M. PICARD: Nous ne voyons pas très bien comment ça pourrait fonctionner un organisme comme celui-là, parce qu'en réalité, si par exemple, du point de vue du gouvernement canadien, du Parlement canadien plutôt et de la nation qui a appuyé cette idée, l'autorité suprême en matière de radio et de télévision, par voie d'une législation adoptée par le Parlement, a été confiée à une régie d'État, je verrais très mal comment un organisme qui viendrait se placer au-dessus et de la régie d'Etat et des postes privés pourrait constituer vraiment une meilleure autorité que celle qui existe lorsqu'elle lui est déjà dévolue par le Parlement lui-même. En réalité ce n'est rien d'absolument nouveau ça. Dans n'importe quel organisme -- le cas serait peut-être extrême -- mettons qu'entre les différentes

universités à travers le pays on dirait :"On croit que vous n'êtes pas tout à fait en mesure de vous occuper de vos affaires; il est vrai que vous avez la direction chacun de vos universités respectives, mais est-ce que ça ne serait pas préférable qu'il y ait une super-autorité, un super-conseil inter-universitaire avec encore plus d'autorité que chacune de vos universités parce que, dans votre cas, on considère que vous ne pouvez pas atteindre les buts pour lesquels vous avez été fondés. Il vous faut une autre autorité qui vienne s'ajouter par là-dessus". A la rigueur, c'est possible; mais comme résultat, je n'y crois pas du tout.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que ce n'est pas ce qui existe dans tout notre système scolaire dans la province de Québec? Vous avez des écoles publiques, vous avez des écoles privées et si les écoles privées veulent faire reconnaître leurs diplômes elles doivent se soumettre au programme d'une autorité supérieure?

M. PICARD: Je comprends, mais vous êtes dans l'ensemble d'un système scolaire, et aussi longtemps qu'il va être reconnu que le primaire n'est pas le secondaire ni le secondaire l'universitaire, vous auriez une hiérarchie où seront déterminées les modalités à suivre soit pour les diplômes soit pour l'enseignement; mais

c'est à l'intérieur du même système scolaire.

M. PELLETIER: Je crois que l'Université illustre bien d'ailleurs pourquoi il ne paraît pas y avoir cette anomalie qu'on dénonce depuis quelques mois en certains milieux, comme vous le savez, parce que, justement, l'Université constitue un cas où, si vous voulez, la maison-mère ou principale est l'Université elle-même pourrait être accusée d'être en concurrence, parce que lui aussi fait de l'enseignement, avec des écoles universitaires qui sont à côté d'elles et de les régir; mais dans le domaine des choses de l'esprit ça nous paraît une chose qui fonctionne très bien et qui est nécessaire, et l'attitude des postes privés selon nous se comparerait mieux à celle d'un de ces collèges privés qui s'installent partout dans la ville pour, à ce moment-là très souvent, se substituer à combler un manque qu'il peut y avoir dans les institutions existantes et qui, ensuite, prétendraient être parfaitement autonomes et être légales de l'institution dont ils sont venus essayer de combler une certaine carence, et on les a laissés faire de façon temporaire; ce qui ne veut pas dire qu'il serait sage de nous engager dans la défense intégrale du système d'enseignement dans la province de Québec.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, à la page 6 de votre mémoire, l'avant-dernier para-

graphe, je pense que vous énoncez là le principe de base sur lequel vous avez édifié tout votre mémoire et toutes vos représentations et toute votre attitude. Je pense que c'est à peu près là qu'on trouve centré le principe de base.

M. PICARD: Il n'y a pas simplement ça. En réalité la responsabilité à la nation, la représentation des intéressés pour participer le plus directement possible dans ce domaine de radio et télévision et culture et éducation, nous croyons que ça constitue à sa base même le début du système qui nous paraît le meilleur.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et de là vous indiquez que le gouvernement doit contrôler ou voir à la bonne marche d'un système qui peut avoir une influence si poussée sur les individus?

M. PELLETIER: Si vous permettez, quand nous parlons de Radio-Canada, pour nous c'est une corporation de la Couronne et non pas le gouvernement, le Gouverneur général en conseil. Il y a tout de même une distinction.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est le Parlement, si vous voulez, parce que Radio-Canada, pour les fins du dossier, est responsable au Parlement.

M. PICARD: Et la distinction qu'on pourrait donner, c'est une entreprise nationalisée qui n'est pas étatisée.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous faites la distinction suivante que les entreprises étatisées sont responsables au gouvernement tandis que les entreprises nationales sont responsables au Parlement?

M. PICARD: Plus que ça. C'est que dans le cas d'étatisation proprement dite, les postes sont vraiment étatisés; c'est un ministère en plus, et tous ceux qui en font partie sont du service civil proprement dit. Le C.N.R. est nationalisé mais pas étatisé, à notre avis.

Me deGRANDPRE: Ce qui me frappe, c'est que dans cette élaboration de ce principe de base on parle aujourd'hui de moyens d'influence moderne; mais est-ce que vous ne trouvez pas que les journaux, les magazines, le cinéma, individuellement ou combinés, ont également une influence presqu'aussi grande sur les idées et les moeurs et sur la vie nationale?

M. PELLETIER: Il y a une différence de base, je crois, parce qu'un journal, par exemple, un mouvement comme le nôtre avec 100,000 membres peut en posséder un. Un poste de télévision, on n'y rêve pas. Un poste de radio, on pourrait y rêver mais ce serait assez vain. Dans le domaine de la presse, non seulement il y a la liberté de parole qui est beaucoup plus direc-

tement impliquée à cause d'une tradition, mais il y a aussi que dans ces domaines on ne les trouve pas tout à fait inaccessibles, si ce n'est à l'Etat et au grand capital comme on affirme que la télévision l'est, par exemple. Il ne s'agit pas de faire de l'artisanat ou de la petite industrie en télévision. Il y a certains postes qui en font encore et on voit les résultats que ça donne; mais à l'origine il y avait le grand capital.

Tandis que la presse -- je le déplorerai avec vous, maître, si vous voulez vous lancer dans une dissertation à ce sujet -- que la grande presse est en effet pas mal en dehors du contrôle de qui que ce soit sauf de ceux qui la possèdent. Il reste quand même que la presse est un domaine où on peut plus facilement entrer; mais le fond de notre pensée, ou si vous voulez l'origine ou là où nos sentiments se sont précisés à ce sujet-là, c'est en ayant à traiter avec des postes privés, comme notre requête à la fin l'indique. C'est un cas qui illustre bien notre attitude.

Nous sommes devant ces gens-là, nous leur donnons un texte dont il y a ici un exemple qui est absolument anodin; vous vous trouvez devant un monsieur qui excèle peut-être à vendre des cacahuètes et qui a fait fortune là-dedans, mais qui n'a certainement pas acheté de la sociologie, et vous êtes obligé de discuter

avec lui jusqu'à l'absurde pour lui montrer que ce texte-là n'est pas suggestif. Et ce monsieur-là, sa décision est sans appel parce que le poste lui appartient, c'est sa propriété, vous n'avez rien à faire là-dedans si ce n'est peut-être attendre trois ans pour aller devant le Bureau des Gouverneurs contester le renouvellement de son permis.

Tandis que devant Radio-Canada, avec toutes les faiblesses qu'on lui reconnaît et même qu'on lui attribue, il reste qu'on se sent devant des gens qui ne peuvent pas dire "Ca nous appartient, c'est notre affaire et fichez-nous la paix".

M. PICARD: Et si nous poussons le raisonnement à l'extrême dans le domaine privé, notre manière de voir devrait être celle-ci: il devrait être spécifié dans la loi qu'une centrale syndicale a le droit d'avoir un poste de télévision; et à partir de ce moment-là, si je me fais égoiste et en vue des profits qui pourraient être faits et l'influence que nous aurions assez facilement, je ne sais pas si ça serait dans l'intérêt général. Cependant, si nous nous placions sous un aspect purement égoiste, c'est ce que nous pourrions demander: de nous passer un poste de télévision.

M. TURCOTTE: Télévision ou radio?

M. PICARD: Les deux. Mais après,

évidemment, il y aurait immédiatement un tollé général pour dire :"Vous voyez bien qu'il y a des secteurs de la population qui sont en train de prendre le contrôle de l'opinion publique par des moyens qui doivent être à la disposition de tout le monde."

Me deGRANDPRE: Si vous poussiez votre argument encore plus loin, est-ce que vous ne devriez pas demander l'étatisation ou la nationalisation, pour ne pas qu'on s'embarque dans un débat sur ce point-là -- des journaux, du cinéma, des magazines qui, dans leur ensemble sinon indidivuellement, influencent autant l'opinion publique et les moeurs que la télévision prise seule?

M. PELLETIER: D'abord, on contesterait que ça l'influence autant et de façon aussi constante; -- moi je contesterais ça personnellement et je pense que la preuve serait assez facile à faire -- et je reviens à ce que je disais tout à l'heure; il reste que dans le cinéma d'abord, il ne s'agit pas de demander de l'étatiser parce qu'il n'en existe pas au Canada; c'est même une question que toutes les nations ne sont pas en état d'en faire; étatiser ce qui se fait comme cinéma au Canada, vous savez, c'est presque fait avec l'Office National du Film, parce qu'en dehors de ça il ne peut pas s'en faire, et étatiser aux Etats-Unis ça serait une autre question, car

là on discuterait d'une puissance étrangère. Et je vous répète ce que je vous ai dis de la presse. Il reste que la presse ce n'est pas aussi complètement exclu et à part ça, ça touche de façon encore plus directe la liberté de parole qui nous force à des tolérances et à des accommodements avec la réalité qui ne sont pas nécessaires dans le domaine de la tlévision; ou du moins c'est ce que pensons.

Me deGRANDPRE: La distinction que vous faites c'est que l'influence - une des distinctions que vous faites -- c'est que l'influence n'est pas aussi quotidienne et aussi constante et aussi profonde?

M. PICARD: Et massive. Et remarquez bien aussi qu'il se trouve à y avoir plus de choix parce que lorsque vous faites entrer un jounal à votre foyer, c'est vous qui allez payer pour que ce soit celui-là en particulier; mais lorsque vous avez un appareil de télévision, par exemple, sur les programmes qui arrivent à votre foyer, même si vous ne voulez pas les avoir, il y a certainement une influence qui est beaucoup plus grande du seul fait que c'est là, et ça demande, je soumets, un meilleur contrôle d'ordre général, parce que vous pénétrez à fond dans un domaine qui est beaucoup plus intime.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, vous avez

parlé également tout à l'heure de l'élargissement des cadres du Bureau des Gouverneurs de Radio-Canada. Est-ce que vous pourriez nous donner des précisions à ce sujet?

M. PELLETIER: Des précisions de quel ordre? Je peux dire, la proposition nous semble claire en elle-même; c'est à vous à nous dire où elle est obscure, je veux bien croire qu'elle l'est.

Me deGRANDPRE: Par exemple, vous voulez, vous suggérez que des représentants de la radio privée soient invités à siéger, si je comprends bien, au Bureau des Gouverneurs. Est-ce que votre proposition va jusque là? C'est pour ça que je vous pose la question. C'est que j'ai cru comprendre à un moment donné que vous aviez suggéré que des représentants des postes privés soient invités à siéger.

M. PELLETIER: C'est un euphémisme de dire que ce n'est pas à eux qu'on a pensé en premier, en tout cas.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous n'avez pas parlé d'une collaboration plus grande au sein d'une organisation de régie?

M. PELLETIER: Pour résumer, je pense qu'on pourrait dire en général c'est l'action d'une commission comme celle-ci que nous voudrions par ses comités consultatifs perpétuer. C'est de la démocratie plus poussée si vous voulez, et en

action.

La commission, ici, est représentative par ses commissaires, par ses conseillers et par les gens qui se présentent devant elle et qui ont quelque chose à dire là-dessus. Nous voudrions que des comités consultatifs rendent permanente l'influence de tous les grands corps de la nation qui croient avoir quelques chose à dire et qui voudraient l'exprimer, mais alors dans des comités permanents pour lesquels il ne s'agirait pas, comme ici, de faire un rapport et ensuite de fermer ses portes; mais ces comités pourraient avoir une action permanente et durable, c'est-à-dire amener au Bureau des Gouverneurs l'opinion à mesure qu'elle se fait et qu'elle se constitue à travers le pays, et nous croyons -- nous sommes d'ailleurs bien placés pour y croire -- que l'influence des grands corps représentatifs parmi lesquels bien sûr nous plaçons le syndicalisme et nous plaçons aussi les universités, nous plaçons aussi les associations que vous avez entendues ici, pourraient exercer une influence sur le Bureau des Gouverneurs. Nous croyons que c'est un degré plus avancé de démocratie qui pourrait aider la régie de la radio à mieux faire son travail.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et c'est seulement dans ce sens-là que vous parliez d'élargir les

cadres de Radio-Canada, uniquement par ces comités consultatifs?

M. PELLETIER: Nous croyons aussi que le Bureau des Gouverneurs lui-même, il y aurait de la place pour quelques fauteuils de plus sur le plan de la représentation.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous croyez qu'à l'heure actuelle le nombre des Gouverneurs est insuffisant ou que le choix est trop restreint dans les divers genres d'activités.

M. PICARD: C'est un peu comme les diverses commissions, comme un bon nombre de commissions administratives. Les nominations, elles peuvent être bonnes pour celles qui sont faites; ça peut être incomplet au point de vue de la représentation en général. Alors, nous partons dans le domaine syndical à peu près généralement del'idée qu'il devrait y avoir continuellement consultation avant la préparation de législations et qu'ensuite il devrait y avoir participation des organisations les plus représentatives dans l'application des législations. Et ceci peut amener la représentation autant sur les organismes administratifs que sur les organismes consultatifs. Nous croyons que c'est une démocratie en action qui, à ce moment-là, se produirait.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous voudriez voir à la fois une représentation, si vous voulez, territoriale et à la fois une représentation de

L-240

groupes plus complète.

M. PICARD: Sur le mode de représentation, remarquez bien, le système que nous préconisons peut sûrement être perfectionné, mais il donne l'idée générale que nous avons à l'esprit lorsque nous demandons que cette représentation puisse se faire, et c'est un peu ce qui se passe dans à peu près toutes les activités ordinaires de la société. Il est très rare que même une personne indépendamment des organismes, fasse quelque chose sans désirer savoir soit sous forme de critique ou d'approbation, quel en est l'effet; et lorsque vous êtes dans un domaine supérieur où les intérêts de la nation même sont en jeu, c'est encore plus important de voir quel peut être l'effet d'un certain nombre de décisions.

Comme mentionnait M. Pelletier tout à l'heure, à l'égard de certains programmes, sans doute que ça amène les comités et ce bureau à faire le choix de programmes généraux, à en confier l'application ensuite à leurs techniciens et à recevoir leur avis; et le public en général -- s'il s'agissait d'aller faire un referendum à chaque fois, ça ne pourrait pas se faire d'une manière ordonnée à cause de cet ensemble d'opinion contradictoire qui pourrait contribuer à paralyser le système, mais comme le public même admet que sa représentation, elle, se fait normalement par

les organismes qu'il a lui-même institués ou qu'il appuie et dont il désire connaître l'opinion en regard de tout le problème qui le concerne; il peut être d'accord ou non, mais je crois que quant à l'expression même d'opinion et à la partiticipation de ces organismes représentatifs, qu'il s'agisse de conseils consultatifs ou même d'une commission administravive, je crois, c'est notre conviction, c'est une idée qui est à la fois bien vue de la population et qui est pratique dans son exécution.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, pour arriver à cette question de forums, de conférences de presse, etc., est-ce que vous croyez que la formule adoptée par Radio-Canada à l'heure actuelle est la bonne? Voici ce que j'ai en tête: on nous a indiqué à plusieurs reprises lors de notre voyage dans l'Ouest et dans les Maritimes, que la formule adoptée à l'heure actuelle était une formule qui voulait absolument faire voir les deux côtés de la médaille au cours de la même émission et que vous aviez un meneur de jeu qui présentait le problème au début et que vous aviez trois ou quatre participants et que l'émission ne durant que 28 minutes, il y avait un handicap à peu près insurmontable pour permettre à ces gens-là d'exprimer leur point de vue d'une façon complète; et on nous a suggéré deux solutions: la première, c'était d'allonger la période, et la seconde c'était de ne présenter qu'un seul point de vue à un programme et donner

une chance de réplique à un programme subséquent. Est-ce que vous avez des comentaires à ce sujet-là?

M. PICARD: Je crois que la formule comme telle est acceptable lorsqu'on offre aux deux parties d'être représentées à un même programme. Il n'y a pas d'objection de notre part du tout à cela, que les deux parties soient représentées dans un même programme, qu'ils puissent être interrogés par les journalistes eux-mêmes sous la direction d'un animateur ou d'un meneur de jeu, peu importe, et si par ailleurs l'une des parties refuse, je crois qu'elle ne devrait pas avoir un droit de riposte par la suite mais que la partie qui accepte devrait avoir l'occasion de participer au programme, sauf qu'elle participera seule.

C'est arrivé dans une occasion où j'y ai été mêlé personnellement; c'était sur le réseau anglais, où les deux parties avaient été invitées de se rendre à un programme et où trois ou quatre journalistes devaient poser des questions. L'autre partie a refusé et la direction a accepté que nous soyons seuls représentés si nous étions d'accord pour répondre aux questions qui seraient posées, naturellement. Nous avons été d'accord. Et ç'aurait été injuste, je crois, si l'autre partie, après avoir refusé aurait eu la latitude d'aller à un autre programme seule et débiter n'importe quoi. Nous avions accepté d'y être avec

l'autre partie.

M. PELLETIER: Ca, c'est un point que nous mentionnons comme tel dans le mémoire, n'est-ce pas, que le refus d'une partie n'empêche pas Radio-Canada de tenir une discussion, qu'on est en démocratie, que chacun doit avoir le courage de ses gestes publics et qu'on ouvre le forum aux deux parties, et s'il y en a une qui ne veut pas venir, eh bien, que ça ne boycotte pas automatiquement l'autre parce que c'est trop simple. On a qu'à s'abstenir pour que tout fiche le camp par terre.

Je crois, pour ma part -- mais c'est une opinion tellement technique en matière de radio que je ne voudrais pas l'attribuer à toute la CTCC -- je crois qu'il est de la nature et de l'intérêt profond d'un programme que dans un forum des gens échangent des opinions contraires. Je crois que vous diminueriez l'auditoire dangereusement parce que beaucoup moins de gens sont disposés à écouter un monsieur exposer seul son opinion qu'avoir deux messieurs faire un combat royal sur des opinions qui sont opposées. Je crois que ça diminuerait l'intérêt de l'émission.

Et "Conférence de Presse", par exemple, ne prouve pas le contraire, parce que je crois que la conférence de presse c'est un peu la torture du moyen-âge assimilée à la sauce civilisation,

parce que vous attelez quand même quatre journalistes à faire de la misère au type qui est là, ou deux à lui faire de la misère et deux à lui faciliter les choses; et vous avez aussi un élément dramatique au sens de tension entre deux tendances; mais je crois que de remplacer ces émissions où des opinions contraires sont mises aux prises par des émissions où des messieurs seuls exposeraient leur opinion, ce serait du point de vue de la radiogénie ou de la télégénie des émissions en cause, un désastre parce que vous ôtez l'élément spectacle.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, et c'est ma dernière question, vous indiquez que le groupe ouvrier comme tel est prêt à payer le coût de Radio-Canada ou des émissions de la radio-Etat; et à ce sujet-là vous suggérez que des octrois statutaires soient donnés à Radio-Canada.

Dans un autre mémoire que nous allons entendre un peu plus tard ce matin ou cet après-midi, on nous suggère la formule du "Pay as you see" qui permet à celui qui utilise l'appareil de payer pour le coût de l'émission. En somme, il s'agirait presque d'un mètre qui serait installé dans l'appareil et si vous vous servez de votre appareil vous payez pour ce que vous recevez et si votre appareil est silencieux vous ne payez rien. Est-ce que de cette façon-là vous n'avez pas encore une

répartition plus équitable du coût?

M. PICARD: Je pense que ce que nous pouvons dire, c'est que nous sommes prêts à faire notre part mais non pas à payer seuls. Autrement, s'il s'agissait simplement de voir dans un autre domaine, disons en matière d'impôt sur le revenu, quels sont exactement les besoins d'un gouvernement ou d'un autre, il y aurait immédiatement des réductions assez sensibles qui seraient faites, et il y a une raison à cela: c'est que s'il y axcédent des budgets à l'heure actuelle, que nous connaissons tous, et qu'une partie de ces excédents de budgets ne peuvent faire autrement que de servir soit dans les domaines comme radio et télévision , soit la sécurité sociale, parce que ce n'est plus vrai que les impôts ont été faits pour équilibrer le budget. Ce qui est devenu vrai c'est que c'est une mesure qui a une fonction économique puis où il y a relation directe avec le pouvoir d'achat de la population, qui n'existait pas il y a un quart de siècle. Si c'était une institution d'intérêt public, il y a des gens qui se trouvent à payer quand même pour l'administration des Postes et qui n'écrivent pas une lettre pendant l'année. La vente des timbres, ce n'est pas ça qui est le revenu total qui permet au Ministère des Postes de balancer son budget; c'est parce que c'est nécessaire s'il y a un Ministère des Postes.

M. PELLETIER: La solution que vous préconisé ne paraîtrait certainement pas équitable.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je ne préconise rien. Je vous dis simplement que nous avons une représentation dans ce sens-là.

M. PELLETIER: Ce que vous proposez à notre esprit pour critique ne paraît pas équitable, justement parce que ça va contre un des arguments que nous développons dans le mémoire, à savoir que c'est certainement le milieu ouvrier qui fait le plus grand usage de la télévision. D'ailleurs, ç'a été pendant un certain temps au grand scandale des délicats qui trouvaient que c'était honteux de voir une forêt d'antennes de télévision dans les milieux ouvriers alors que la bourgeoisie très décente et ayant le sens de l'économie n'en achetait pas. C'est un phénomène extrêmement naturel. C'est un phénomène extrêmement naturel. C'est que, comme nous le disons, c'est non pas la seule source de culture, n'exagérons rien, il ne faut pas s'emballer, mais c'est une source de culture dans le milieu populaire beaucoup plus importante étant donné qu'elle est presque seule que pour les gens de plus grande fortune qui peuvent voyager, qui peuvent payer trois dollars pour aller au théâtre, au concert, etc.

Alors, non seulement ça nous paraît pas équitable mais ça nous paraîtrait même injuste à ce moment-là si les gens qui consomment, et comme les gens qui consomment sont ceux qui con-

somment parce qu'ils ont moins d'autres sources auxquelles ils peuvent consommer, ça serait encore une fois leur faire payer à eux totalement ce qu'ils ont. A part çà, j'ajouterais comme un argument d'importance moindre, je vous poserais la question: si vous avez déjà trouvé dans un hôtel ou dans un motel un appareil dans lequel vous êtes obligé de mettre trente sous. C'est frustrant, mauvais pour la bonne humeur de la population.

M. TURCOTTE: M. Picard, votre confédération attache beaucoup d'importance à la culture populaire, à l'éducation populaire par le truchement très utile de la radio et de la télévision. Vous estimez que ce sont des instruments très utiles. Il y a plusieurs références, cela revient constamment à travers votre mémoire et vous avez même relevé la chose dans votre sommaire. Songez-vous dans ce domaine-là uniquement à ce qu'on pourrait appeler "l'éducation des adultes" ou étendez-vous ça à tout le domaine même aux possibilités dans l'ordre scolaire de la radio, par exemple, et de la télévision?

M. PICARD: Nous allons jusque là, monsieur le Commissaire, parce que nous croyons que ces moyens qui sont des auxiliaires précieux, nous ne voudrions pas reprendre l'expérience qui a été faite avec le cinéma à ses débuts. Le cinéma est un moyen aussi d'éducation. Il ne faut pas remonter à un grand nombre d'années pour se rendre

compte que justement parce qu'il a été laissé à peu près à tout hasard, il y a toute une période -- qui s'est modifiée j'admets -- mais il y a toute une période où on ne peut pas dire qu'il a pu être un auxiliaire à l'éducation même, parce que ses limites étaient beaucoup trop étroites. Il y avait même une sorte d'opposition, je dirais, contre ce progrès qui venait de se manifester à l'arrivée du cinéma parlant, par exemple, mais aujourd'hui et avec l'expérience qui a été acquise nous croyons que dans ce domaine de la radio et de la télévision ces domaines sont de précieux auxiliaires et pas exclusivement pour les adultes.

M. TURCOTTE: Aussi pour les enfants d'âge scolaire.

M. PICARD: Aussi pour les enfants d'âge scolaire la même chose, parce qu'il y a certains documentaires ou certains programmes où il y a suffisamment de vulgarisation pour que ça aide même un enfant d'âge scolaire à se perfectionner. Je prends un domaine -- ce n'est pas un domaine d'agrément: la géographie . Il n'y a pas de doute qu'un enfant d'âge scolaire a peut-être plus de chance d'apprendre sa géographie à la télévision que dans unvolume. On a l'image à ce moment-là qui va le frapper, et je suis convaincu qu'à l'heure actuelle, si je prends la géographie de la canalisation du St-Laurent, je serais curieux de savoir combien

il y a de Canadiens qui la connaissent, et je suis convaincu que s'il y avait quelques programmes de télévision que ça fixerait ce qui se passe entre Montréal et Prescott.

M. TURCOTTE: Dans le contexte du système actuel de la radio et de la télévision au Canada, avec un système mixte dans lequel participent des postes publics et des postes privés dans toutes les provinces, comment concevez-vous les possibilités de radio et de télévision scolaires, tenant compte surtout de l'autonomie des différentes provinces? Est-ce que c'est possible d'atteindre le but que vous proposez en respectant les lois de toutes les provinces en même temps? Croyez-vous que cela soit possible?

M. PICARD: Ca nous paraît possible, monsieur le commissaire, parce que ça nous paraît faire simplement l'objet d'ententes à ce sujet-là; et puis si une province manifestait une opposition de principe ça serait regrettable, parce que c'est un des domaines où la population a besoin que ceux qui doivent discuter de ces matières puissent réaliser l'importance qu'il y a de se mettre d'accord sur un certain nombre de programmes qui vont justement tenir compte à la fois des besoins et des situations qui peuvent se présenter dans l'une ou l'autre des dix provinces. Nous croyons que c'est possible.

M. TURCOTTE: Vous envisageriez

peut-être que chaque province prépare son propre programme et le mette en ondes par le truchement des postes existants, publics et privés?

M. PICARD: Et puis vous avez certain nombre de programmes toutefois qui devraient être canalisés par l'intermédiaire des commissions consultatives pour que justement l'accord se fasse.

M. TURCOTTE: C'est là peut-être que vos comités consultatifs dont vous proposez la création fonctionneraient?

M. PICARD: Ca serait peut-être important, parce que ça pourrait jouer dans les deux sens; un moment donné l'initiative d'une idée peut venir d'un organisme provincial, si vous voulez, et dans un cas l'initiative peut bien partir de la commission consultative et ça peut être sur des sujets semblables. Alors il y a intérêt à ce que la communication s'établisse et puis qu'une entente puisse être conclue.

M. PELLETIER: Non seulement nous considérons que c'est possible mais nous considérons même que c'est urgent, et nous sommes assez malheureux de cas qui nous sont cités, comme celui-là, par exemple, d'une lettre que reçoit un monsieur qui fait un programme, qui pourraitêtre un programme scolaire si les ententes existaient, et qui dit: "Je réunis à six heures, dans ma maison chez moi, mes élèves pour regarder votre programme parce que

vous pouvez dans cette matière apporter à ma classe un secours que je suis absolument incapable de lui apporter avec les moyens dont je dispose; mais ne mentionnez pas mon nom, je fais ça en cachette". Ca nous paraît une absurdité, le contre-progrès par définition. Et nous croyons que non seulement c'est urgent mais que la population en général voudrait bien trouver le moyen de forcer les autorités de s'entendre entre elles pour qu'on ne reste pas dans un imbroglio et que ce secours à l'éducation formelle dans la mesure évidemment où les pédagogues compétents jugent que ça peut, sans briser un programme scolaire, intervenir dans une école; on ne comprend pas qu'on en soit privé.

M. TURCOTTE: D'où viendrait l'initiative? De Radio-Canada ou d'un corps comme le vôtre ou de l'Association des éducateurs de langue française ou de langue anglaise ou de l'Association Canadienne des sociétés des adultes? Quelqu'un doit prendre l'initiative, mais vous exprimez simplement un souhait sans indiquer la façon concrète de réaliser ce souhait.

M. PICARD: Simplement parce que ça nous paraît que l'ensemble des modalités qui pourraient entourer la réalisation d'un souhait comme celui-là seraient peut-être difficiles à détailler dans un mémoire, et nous croyons qu'elles pourraient plus facilement être exposées et réglées si

nous facilitons aux organismes eux-mêmes qui seraient intéressés, si nous leur facilitons ce contact et cette communication avec Radio-Canada de manière à trouver la solution raisonnable.

D'ailleurs, notre proposition, c'est entendu, celle que nous faisons ici, elle va être transmise également aux autres organismes qui peuvent être intéressés en cette matière parce qu'ils auront naturellement...

M. TURCOTTE: Aux autres organismes... vous voulez dire Radio-Canada. Vous parlez de ce mémoire que vous aviez destiné à Radio-Canada.

M. PICARD: Il y a des suggestions, n'est-ce pas, comme lorsqu'il s'agit de commissions consultatives, lorsqu'il s'agit d'ententes entre les provinces et Radio-Canada.

M. TURCOTTE: Dans le domaine de l'éducation?

M. PICARD: Dans le domaine de l'éducation la même idée va être exprimée par nous également.

M. TURCOTTE: Je crois que de telles ententes de cette nature existent déjà, vous savez.

M. PICARD: Ca devrait être assez

simple, dans ce cas-là, de les compléter ou de les élargir selon le cas.

M. TURCOTTE: Une autre question. Est-ce que votre Confédération possède des syndicats en dehors de la province de Québec?

M. PICARD: La presque totalité de nos effectifs sont dans la province de Québec. Il y a peut-être quatre ou cinq syndicats en dehors des limites de la province de Québec, et deux ou trois du côté de l'Ontario et un, je crois, au Nouveau-Brunswick.

M. TURCOTTE: Je demandais cette question parce qu'à la page 13 vous parlez de certaines populations de langue française, par exemple, au Nouveau-Brunswick, en Nouvelle-Ecosse, en Colombie-Anglaise, qui sont insuffisamment et parfois pas du tout desservies par des émissions de leur langue. Je crois que vous répondiez simplement à un désir de vos syndicats. Vous le faites simplement...

M. PICARD: A ce moment-là, c'est simplement le résultat d'enquêtes, parce que prenant pour acquis, comme nous le formulons par exemple pour les deux commissions consultatives, que cette double culture qu'il y a au Canada devrait être maintenue, par voie d'enquêtes, les renseignements que nous avons obtenus, pas par nos membres de l'Ouest parce que nous n'en avons pas, mais

que nous avons obtenus, nous ont permis de formuler ce qui apparaît au mémoire.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Picard and Mr. Pelletier we want to thank you again for coming and submitting this brief.

I should have said at the outset this morning when we looked over the programme for today particularly with the carry-over from this one important brief from yesterday, we thought it was quite impossible for us to complete the remaining of the hearings today. We therefore are arranging that three briefs will go over to tomorrow morning. I am sorry about this for those who are held in Montreal perhaps, because it is that we have just gone as long as we can. We will therefore have two more briefs this morning and three this afternoon and we will have three tomorrow morning. I think we will rise now for five minutes.

---

L-255

Montréal, le 14 septembre 1956.

Mémoire soumis par

LA SOCIETE CANADIENNE D'EDUCATION DES ADULTES

PRESENTS:

M. CLAUDE RYAN, président,
R.P. ANTONI TOUPIN, o.m.i.,
M. PAUL-HENRI LAVOIE,
M. JULES BRETON,
M. JEAN BRUNELLE,
M. LEO BERUBE,
M. MAURICE TREMBLAY,
M. J.-FRANCOIS SEGUIN
M. REAL CHARBONNEAU

---

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is that of La Société Canadienne d'Education des Adultes, which will be marked as Exhibit No 194.

EXHIBIT No 194: Submission by La Société Canadienne d'Education des Adultes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Ryan you are presenting the brief. As you know our procedure you may use either French or English in presentation and we will have question that we will have to ask both by Counsel and ourselves either during the presentation or at the end. Those questions are intended not to disagree with you, not to indicate any point of view but solely to try and bring out the full submission that you are making. Any conclusions of course must come later. My questions will have to be in English but I do understand your French and the

reply can be in French.

M. CLAUDE RYAN: Monsieur le président, je voudrais tout d'abord vous présenter mes confrères de la délégation de la Société Canadienne d'Education des Adultes, en partant de la gauche, le Révérend Père Antoni Toupin, de l'Université d'Ottawa, vice-président de la Société; monsieur Paul-Henri Lavoie, directeur du journal "La Terre de Chez nous, membre de l'exécutif et du conseil d'administration; M. Jules Breton, gérant général de l'Association forestière du Québec, membre de l'exécutif et du conseil d'administration; M. Jean Brunette, de Montréal, de la Chambre de Commerce de Montréal et en même temps membre de l'exécutif de la Société et du conseil d'administration; M. Léo Bérubé, secrétaire général du Conseil de la coopération du Canada; M. Maurice Tremblay, directeur de l'éducation à la Société Canadienne d'établissement rural; M. Jean-François Séguin, secrétaire-général de l'Union des cultivateurs franco-ontariens; M. Réal Charbonneau, président du comité consultatif "Les Idées en Marche", qui est une organisation conjointe de la Société Radio-Canada et de la Société Canadienne de l'Education des Adultes.

Je voudrais tout d'abord vous dire, monsieur le président, tout le plaisir que nous éprouvons ce matin à venir rencontrer votre Commission. Le léger retard que vous avez eu à la fin de la première séance a été pour nous l'occasion de

constater le sérieux avec lequel votre Commission accomplit son travail. Nous vous souhaitons bon succès jusqu'à la fin. Nous espérons que les quelques remarques et observations consignées dans notre rapport vous seront utiles.

Pour sauver le plus de temps possible, peut-être pourrions-nous parcourir le mémoire ensemble dans ses grandes lignes. Nous sauterons la plupart des paragraphes et nous irons de page en page nous arrêtant là où ça nous semblera nécessaire.

THE CHAIRMAN: You don't need to read it all. We will come to the conclusions or suggestions at the end, and we can go through them when we get to them.

M. RYAN: Je voudrais tout d'abord dire un mot sur le caractère même de la Société d'Education des Adultes. C'est un organisme de caractère fédératif, qui remplit un rôle de coordination dans le milieu canadien. Comme telle la Société groupe des éléments extrêmement divers, allant des Chambres de Commerce jusqu'aux mouvements syndicaux en passant par l'Union Catholique des Cultivateurs et toute une kyrielle d'organisations à caractère culturel ou à but éducatif.

Ce caractère de la Société lui donne d'un côté un rôle représentatif très large, mais en même temps illustre de manière réelle la portée

de ses interventions. On ne peut pas dire que la Société Canadienne d'Education des Adultes intervient officiellement au nom de la CTCC ou de l'UCC ou de la Chambre deCommerce. Chacune de ces organisations présente ses propres positions et est encouragée par la Société Canadienne de l'Education des Adultes à agir de cette sorte-là.

Les positions qui sont présentées ce matin sont celles de la Société Canadienne d'Education des Adultes telles qu'approuvées par son exécutif et son conseil d'administration dont vous avez la liste des membres à la fin du mémoire. C'est vous dire que le mémoire a été approuvé à l'unanimité et qu'il n'a pas rencontré d'objection majeure depuis qu'il a reçu sa forme définitive.

Nous nous intéressons particulièrement au problème de la radio et de la télévision d'abord en raison de l'impact de plus en plus considérable de l'activité de la télévision et de la radio sur la culture populaire; mais aussi en raison de notre propre expérience dans ce domaine depuis quelques années.

Comme nous l'indiquons au bas de la page 6 et au haut de la page 7, la Société Canadienne d'Education des adultes collabore depuis plusieurs années à la réalisation d'émissions comme "Les Idées en Marche" et le "Choc des Idées". Cette collaboration de la Société se fait sur une base très

large, dont l'un de nos représentants pourra vous expliquer les caractères, si vous êtes intéressés, tout à l'heure. Notre dernière expérience a été une collaboration à la réalisation d'un Ciné-Club à la télévision au cours de la saison estivale. Chaque année nous publions également un calendrier ou répertoire des émissions de radio et de télévision à caractère éducatif. Nous remettrons des exemplaires de ces publications au Secrétaire de la Commission qui pourra vous en passer des copies.

Autorité du présent mémoire. Comme je disais tantôt, il a été approuvé par le conseil d'administration. Il n'engage que la Société. Ses organismes-membres restent libres de présenter leurs propres vues à la Commission royale. La Société les a encouragés à le faire. Comme le Secrétaire de la Commission vous l'a sans doute rapporté, dès février dernier la Société prenait l'initiative de convoquer à Montréal tous les groupements de langue française intéressés au travail de la Commission pour les familiariser le plus tôt possible avec les objectifs de votre Commission et les encourager en même temps à préparer une intervention au nom de leur organisme respectif.

On peut affirmer qu'étant donné le caractère largement représentatif de la Société Canadienne, que le présent mémoire représente les vues du mouvement de l'éducation des adultes du

Canada de langue française sur les problèmes soumis à l'attention de la Commission.

Alors, le reste du mémoire est divisé, si mes souvenirs sont bons, en quatre parties. Nous avons d'abord "La politique canadienne en matière de diffusion". Je vais lire une couple de paragraphes qui semblent pour nous capitaux.

La politique canadienne en matière de diffusion doit reposer sur quelques normes fondamentales inspirées par la nature même des modes des communications impliqués, par les conditions économiques et sociales propres au Canada, par l'histoire de la radiodiffusion et de la télévision au pays et dans le monde. Ces divers facteurs suggèrent les normes suivantes comme correspondant aux besoins actuels du pays:

1- Etant donné que, d'après le témoignage des techniciens du Ministère des Transports, déposé devant le Comité Parlementaire de la Diffusion en mars 1955, le nombre des fréquences pouvant servir actuellement à la diffusion tant sonore que télévisée est limité, la radio et la télévision doivent être considérées comme des services dont l'orientation sera principalement commandée par l'intérêt public.

2- Etant donné, d'une part, la grande influence de ces modes de communications sur la mentalité et la vie du peuple, et d'autre part,

les conditions propres du Canada, à savoir, la grande étendue géographique, la faiblesse numérique de la population, la nécessité de fournir un service bilingue, la présence immédiate d'un voisin puissant et pénétrant, l'intérêt public demande que les valeurs culturelles et sociales impliquées dans l'usage de la radio et de la télévision aient priorité sur les valeurs commerciales et les valeurs de pur divertissement, sans que ces dernières soient reléguées au rancart et méprisées et sous-estimées.

Nous suggérons donc, en nous inspirant fortement de l'histoire de la diffusion au Canada, depuis plus d'un quart de siècle, de continuer à orienter la politique gouvernementale d'après les grandes lignes que voici:

D'abord, que le gouvernement canadien continue, par l'intermédiaire de Radio-Canada, de jouer un rôle actif sur le plan de la production. Deuxièmement, il nous apparaît plus sain - et plus économique au surplus, de ne pas confier exclusivement à l'Etat le soin d'assurer seul la réalisation de toute la diffusion. L'entreprise privée a démontré qu'elle peut jouer en ce domaine un rôle utile et varié.

Troisièmement, c'est une des positions les plus importantes du mémoire, il faut voir dans une lumière complémentaire - plutôt que sous un jour d'opposition ou de concurrence - le rôle res-

pectif de l'Etat et de l'entreprise privée en ce domaine.

Finalement, il faut que l'Etat assure une coordination efficace et positive de tout ce domaine d'activité.

Comme conséquence de ces normes proposées, nous suggérons que la Commission recommande au gouvernement de maintenir un seul régime national en radio-télévision, pour les raisons qui sont expliquées en page 9. Dans le domaine de la télévision, tout en recommandant le développement d'un service national qui desserve également les deux principaux groupes culturels du pays et les diverses régions géographiques, nous demandons de viser à ne pas précipiter le développement de ce médium, parce que nous craignons que les ressources financières et surtout culturelles limitées dont dispose un pays à population faible comme le nôtre serait rapidement épuisées si nous proposons d'échéances trop vite.

Cela ne nous empêche pas un peu plus loin de présenter deux recommandations qui peuvent paraître des contradictions mais qui ne le sont pas dans notre opinion, qui sont plutôt le prolongement de ce service général que nous voudrions avoir. Nous trouvons qu'à Montréal et à Québec il faudrait envisager la possibilité d'un service de rechange. Notre position est assez impartiale étant donné qu'à

Montréal c'est un poste deRadio-Canada que nous avons actuellement et qu'à Québec c'est plutôt un poste privé. Nous trouvons que la possibilité d'un service de rechange aiderait beaucoup les auditoires de langue française à ne pas s'alimenter exclusivement aux postes américains quand ils ne sont pas satisfaits d'un programme.

Dans le domaine de la radio nous ne sommes pas en mesure de définir d'une manière précise et sûre quel sera le rôle de la radio lorsque la télévision aura pris toute sa place au Canada, mais nous croyons dès maintenant qu'elle est appelée à survivre dans des formes nouvelles adaptées à l'existence à côté d'elle de la télévision. Nous suggérons que l'on profite de circonstances actuelles pour reviser sur_tout les possibilités éducatives qui restent ouvertes dans le domaine de la diffusion sonore. Nous suggérons en particulier qu'une attention spéciale soit accordée à l'amélioration des émissions consacrées aux questions religieuses, aux affaires publiques, aux problèmes du foyer.

Nous notons aussi au bas de la page 12, que malgré des progrès accomplis depuis quatre ans, en particulier l'ouverture d'un poste de Radio-Canada à Moncton, certains secteurs de la population de langue française restent encore privés de radio sonore. C'est le cas, en particulier,

de la région de Rivière-la-Paix, de près de 25,000 Acadiens de Nouvelle-Ecosse et de plusieurs secteurs francophones de l'Ontario. La Société Canadienne d'Education des Adultes suggère que Radio-Canada prenne les mesures voulues pour étendre le plut tôt possible à ces régions un service complet de diffusion sonore dans leur langue.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ryan, you don't mean when you say "Revise the activities of Radio" so as to exploit its educational values " - you don't mean that radio should cease to have the entertainment values and other traditional things that it has had?

MR. RYAN: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: You merely say that this is a new situation that should be examined.

M. RYAN: Je crois que le principe évoqué en page 8 s'applique encore ici.

Alors, nous passons au chapitre 2, La Société Radio-Canada. Nous avons d'abord des recommandations et des considérations considérant l'organisation générale des programmes, des services auxiliaires, des relations avec le milieu, le financement et l'administration.

Sur l'organisation générale, notre première recommandation porte sur l'élargissement

des cadres du Bureau des Gouverneurs. Il nous semble qu'un tel élargissement serait de nature à favoriser la pleine réalisation des deux objectifs assignés par la Commission Massey à notre système national de diffusion soit :"Favoriser l'unité et la compréhension dans la nation et faire de l'éducation populaire. Nous y reviendrons tantôt. Si les postes privés sont vraiment des associés dans le régime national, qu'ils aient sous une forme ou sous une autre une représentation dans le Bureau des Gouverneurs.

Gérant Général: Afin de prévenir toute ingérence du pouvoir exécutif dans la régie de Radio-Canada, il serait souhaitable que la nomination du gérant général et de son adjoint relève du Bureau des Gouverneurs plutôt que du Conseil des Ministres. C'est, d'ailleurs, ce qui se pratique en Grande-Bretagne. Nous ne prétendons pas dire qu'il y a eu de l'ingérance politique jusque dans la nomination du gérant général.

Coordination générale des services: Les relations d'autorité ou de coordination reliant entre eux les divers services et les diverses régions apparaissent très compliquées pour les organismes extérieurs qui ont à traiter avec Radio-Canada. La Société Canadienne d'Education des Adultes se demande s'il n'y aurait pas lieu de simplifier les structures actuelles.

Service de relations avec les postes

privés: Le service des relations avec les postes privés devrait être complètement distinct du service d'opérations de Radio-Canada. Ce service devrait être rattaché directement au Bureau des Gouverneurs. Il devrait être beaucoup plus développé qu'il ne l'est actuellement. Il devrait être conçu à la fois comme un organisme de coopération active avec les postes privés et de surveillance pour l'application des règlements généraux de la diffusion.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that point, Mr. Ryan, I think there is a department called The Station Relations and Broadcasting Regulations. It has been put to us that these are two inconsistent functions, that the process of station relations leads to co-operative action and discussion and adjustment, whereas the other function is more of an enforcement function -- a compulsory function. Which one of those two are you talking about here as being more appropriately put directly under the Board of Governors? Are you thinking of the Station Relations Department or the enforcement side of it?

M. RYAN: Dans le mémoire, ici, nous parlons des deux; mais si vous demandiez où était l'accent lorsque le mémoire a été préparé, il était sur le développement des relations générales avec les postes privés beaucoup plus que sur l'application négative ou technique des règlements.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have not divided

the two functions in your thinking?

M. RYAN: No. Nous n'avons pas divisé, pour une raison très simple, c'est que les faits que nous avons observés ne nous permettaient pas de diviser parce qu'il y a à peine deux ou trois personnes dans ce département-là, pour la partie française du moins.

Me deGRANDPRE: Mais si on décidait de recommander un agrandissement des cadres, est-ce que vous ne verriez pas là un avantage à ce que le département de la police ne soit pas le département des relations?

M. RYAN: C'est une question que nous n'avons pas discutée entre nous; j'aimerais que mes confrères donnent leuropinion là-dessus. J'aimerais ça qu'on donne nos opinions librement.

M. BRUNELLE: Personnellement, j'aimerais à endosser la suggestion de Me deGRANDPRE que le département de la police soit séparé du département des relations publiques.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce qu'il y en a d'autres qui ne partageraient pas ce point de vue-là?

R.P. TOUPIN, o.m.i. Dans les deux cas se serait différent de l'administration de Radio-Canada.

Me deGRANDPRE: Oui, mais ça serait

un département qui, au lieu de faire des rapports par l'entremise du gérant général et du président, se rapporterait toujours au Bureau des Gouverneurs.

M. RYAN: Nous passons à la partie des programmes. De manière générale, les milieux d'éducation populaire ont une haute idée de la tenue des programmes de Radio-Canada. Nous reconnaissons et apprécions en particulier : la contribution considérable de Radio-Canada dans le progrès et l'expansion de la culture française au pays; le souci de Radio-Canada de donner satisfaction - sans négliger les plus exigeants - aux multiples publics dont se compose l'auditoire des réseaux nationaux; le nombre et la qualité des réalisations proprement canadiennes dans le domaine de la radio.

Tout en reconnaissant la validité d'une certaine distinction administrative entre les services de programmes de la radio et de la télévision, nous croyons qu'il faut veiller, devant le progrès et la popularité phénoménale de la télévision, à ne pas reléguer la radio au rôle de parent pauvre de la télévision. Nous suggérons que la Commission royale étudie, en particulier, la qualité des programmes, les tarifs d'honoraires et de rétribution des artistes et responsables à la lumière de cette recommandation.

Coordination des programmes: La Société Canadienne recommande que la Commission

royale étudie, en particulier, la possibilité d'un regroupement fonctionnel et organique des émissions de la télévision et de la radio, en tenant compte des genres, des heures et des régions. Ceci faciliterait grandement l'usage rationnel par le public de la radio et de la télévision. Il faudrait veiller, dans la répartition des horaires, à assurer une place de choix aux émissions ayant une plus haute portée culturelle.

Centralisation de la production: on se plaint généralement d'une centralisation excessive de la production à Toronto et à Montréal, surtout dans le domaine de la télévision. Nous croyons qu'il faut rechercher des moyens de favoriser une somme raisonnable de réalisations à l'échelon régional.

Standards moraux et idéologiques à la télévision: Nous reconnaissons d'abord que ce n'est pas facile. Nous avons fait une expérience avec le Ciné-Club au cours de l'été qui nous a fait réaliser que c'est une question très complexe, mais quand même nous croyons qu'afin de favoriser l'élaboration graduelle de règles pratiques compatibles avec les exigences des artistes et les légitimes attentes du public, la Société coit que Radio-Canada devrait faciliter sur ce sujet des rencontres périodiques de consultation entre les artisans de la télévision et des représentants

du public. De même, afin d'éviter le plus possible les maladresses ou les erreurs de jugement et d'exercer un contrôle réel et continu sur sa production, Radio-Canada devrait améliorer sensiblement ses services de censure interne chargés de surveiller la conformité des programmes en regard des règlements.

M. TURCOTTE: De ses programmes ou des programmes des postes privés ou des siens en général?

M. RYAN: Ici, c'est pour les programmes de Radio-Canada.

M. TURCOTTE: Les leurs?

M. RYAN: Oui, parce que nous croyons que plus la censure peut s'exercer par des mécanismes internes plus c'est facile et plus c'est simple pour le fonctionnement de ces institutions-là, en particulier pour le climat dans lequel vont travailler les artistes et les réalisateurs.

Certains genres particuliers: Comme vous avez dû lire cette partie-là, peut-être pourrions-nous passer quitte à revenir dans les questions.

Services auxiliaires: Nous croyons que certains services qui ne sont pas directement engagés dans la production y gagneraient à être

développés et perfectionnés pour améliorer la qualité même de la production. Nous pensons à la bibliothèque de Radio-Canada à Montréal. Il nous semble qu'elle devrait être sensiblement développée, en ce qui touche la radio, la télévision et les disciplines reliées à la production des programmes.

Cinémathèque: Nous croyons que la cinémathèque devrait viser à se procurer des copies des meilleurs films de toutes les parties du monde. Il devrait y avoir à ce sujet, un plan systématique réparti sur plusieurs années. Je dois ajouter ici, quand ç'a été soumis au conseil d'administration, que l'expérience faite au cours de l'été avec le Ciné-Club nous enseigne que les disponibilités actuelles en matière de films ne sont pas satisfaisantes. Il faudrait un stock encore plus large de manière que le choix puisse être encore plus judicieux. Nous avons rencontré des problèmes très sérieux au cours de la saison estivale à ce sujet-là.

M. TURCOTTE ; De quoi cela provient-il, à votre connaissance? N'est-ce pas qu'il n'y a pas suffisamment de films sur le marché?

M. RYAN: Je vous dirai franchement que nous ne sommes pas rendus au bout de nos observations là-dessus. Notre comité ne nous a pas soumis son rapport définitif encore. Nous l'aurons vers la fin de septembre parce que le Ciné-Club

se termine vers le 22 ou le 24 septembre. Nous irons faire rapport aux autorités de Radio-Canada de nos conclusions.

M. TURCOTTE: Ne semble-t-il pas y avoir une réticence de la part des producteurs de films à laisser passer leurs films à la télévision?

M. RYAN: J'aime mieux ne pas me prononcer actuellement. Il faudrait voir très bien les responsabilités des deux côtés, et là-dessus il y a des renseignements qui nous manquent encore.

Entraînement: Il devrait y avoir, à Montréal et à Toronto, des services d'entraînement organisés à l'intention des nouveaux membres du personnel de Radio-Canada ( à l'échelon réalisateurs et organisateurs de programmes). Ces services auraient pour but de connâitre davantage les nouveaux employés et de les familiariser avec l'organisation et l'esprit de Radio-Canada. Ils fourniraient aussi à la direction l'occasion de prendre contact avec les nouveaux membres du personnel.

Recherches: Le bureau des recherches et sondages devrait être développé le plus tôt possible de manière à faire porter son travail, non seulement sur les statistiques de l'écoute et autres données numériques, mais aussi sur la pédagogie et la sociologie de la radio et de la télévision. Après 25 années d'expérience dans le domaine de la diffusion, leCanada ne compte pratiquement aucune

littérature originale sur les sujets reliés à la radio et à la télévision. Nous croyons que la faiblesse des 'ratings' actuels c'est qu'ils ne donnent que des renseignements strictement quantitatifs. Ils ne vont pas assez loin dans l'interprétation et dans ce que j'appellerais le nuancement des constatations. Nous croyons que le service des recherches et sondages de Radio-Canada, bien équipé, pourrait aller beaucoup plus loin.

Poste-Laboratoire: La société Canadienne d'Education des Adultes suggère que la Commission royale étudie la possibilité, pour Radio-Canada, de libérer un canal afin de créer un poste-laboratoire, comme celui qui existe en France pour la radio. Ce laboratoire attaché à la Radiodiffusion française diffuse chaque semaine, sur un canal spécial, quelques heures d'émissions à titre expérimental. On entraîne ainsi acteurs, auteurs nouveaux, réalisateurs, etc.

Service des textes: nous souhaitons que ce Service soit orienté et équipé de manière à pouvoir tenir compte, dans l'examen des textes soumis à son attention, non seulement des aspects esthétique et littéraire, mais aussi des aspects éducatif et moral.

Contact avec le milieu: C'est une partie qui nous apparaît très importante parce que c'est la raison d'être de notre coopération avec

Radio-Canada, la philosophie qui est exposée dans ces deux paragraphes. Nous croyons que plus la Société Radio-Canada aura des contacts organiques et réalistes avec le milieu qu'elle est designee pour servir, plus sa contribution sera correspondante aux attentes de la population. Nous donnons ici deux moyens: des sondages et aussi des organismes consultatifs.

La Société canadienne d'Education des Adultes croit beaucoup à l'action d'organismes consultatifs pour l'orientation directe ou indirecte de la politique nationale en matière de diffusion. Nous suggérons non seulement de maintenir les organismes existants mais d'étendre cette action consultative à tout le domaine des émissions éducatives ainsi qu'à d'autres émissions où l'équilibre est difficile à réaliser: téléthéâtre, chroniques littéraires ou artistiques. Nous suggérons également, dans la constitution des organismes consultatifs et dans l'action consultative de Radio-Canada en général, de tenir compte de plus en plus des minorités régionales. Nous croyons que, dans de tels domaines, Radio-Canada y gagnera à aller parfois un peu moins vite afin de maintenir ce contact avec le public qu'elle veut servir. Nous croyons que cette action consultative peut revêtir des formes variées qui vont de contacts personnels jusqu'à des rencontres beaucoup plus organisées.

L-275

Au point de vue du financement et de l'administration, notre première demande s'adresse à la Commission pour établir une évaluation réaliste de ce que devrait coûter au peuple canadien, pour au moins les 5 prochaines années, le régime national de diffusion sonore et télévisée préconisé dans ce mémoire. Notre Société se contente de noter que le budget de Radio-Canada est passé de six millions de dollars en 1945-46, à $43.6 millions en 1955-56, soit une augmentation de 733% en dix ans. La Société suggère à la Commission royale de procéder à une expertise serrée des coûts comparatifs de production, normes qualitatives entrées en ligne de compte, dans les postes privés et Radio-Canada.

Par conséquent, nous comptons beaucoup sur la compétence de la Commission pour nous fournir des estimés réalistes qui tiendront compte en même temps de ce que coûteraient les mêmes entreprises du côté privé.

Une fois dressés les coûts prévisibles d'un régime national de radio et de télévision conçu dans une perspective culturelle, il faudra que le public canadien soit clairement saisi de ces conclusions. La Société considère que nous vions présentement une période d'euphorie dangereuse pour l'avenir même du régime actuel de diffusion; d'un côté, le public acquiert inconsciemment des habitudes dispendieuses; d'autre part,

ce même public est tenu dans l'ignorance du coût réel de ces nouveaux moyens de loisir et de culture. Seule, une opinion publique lucidement et graduellement informée pourra éventuellement accepter les frais de la radio et de la télévision tels que les laisse entrevoir le mémoire soumis à la Commission Royale par laSociété Radio-Canada.

Notre première recommandation viserait à un financement stable. Quelles que soient les sommes requises ou acceptables par le peuple canadien, il serait souhaitable que Radio-Canada puisse compter, pour la majeure partie de son budget, sur des sources de revenus stables et statutaires. Les revenus tirés de ces sources pourraient être sujets à revision quinquennale. Des revenus statutaires auraient un double avantage : soustraire le budget de Radio-Canada aux fluctuations annuelles de la politique; permettre aux dirigeant de Radio-Canada de dresser des plans de développement quelques années à l'avance.Comme sources possibles de revenus possibles:

Il faudra tôt ou tard introduire clairement le principe que les bénéficiaires de la radio et de la télévision, c'est-à-dire la grande majorité des Canadiens, doivent payer pour le service reçu. La Commission royale devrait pouvoir suggérer les modes les plus appropriés de contribution des bénéficiaires. Notre Société suggère que la Commission étudie en particulier l'institution d'un

droit de permis annuel ( cela se pratique en Grande-Bretagne, en France, en Australie, en Suisse, en Allemagne, en Italie), et les possibilités du "pay-as-you-see service". Un tel système pourrait être appliqué à des émissions très populaires, comme certaines productions sportives. Il ne faudrait pas l'appliquer aux émissions culturelles, déjà moins populaires en raison de leur nature même et des goûts du public.

Me deGRANDPRE: Comment pourriez-vous avoir un appareil qui va vous transmettre des émissions éducatives sans payer et des émissions sportives, par exemple, est-ce que c'est facile?

M. RYAN: C'est très facile; c'est une question de bouton. Je ne dis pas que ça ne coûterait pas cher, mais il y a des expériences qui ont été tentées dans la région de Chicago.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est ce que nous allons voir.

M. RYAN: En ce qui concerne la publicité nous croyons que Radio-Canada devrait se retirer complètement du champ commercial. Mais étant donné que Radio-Canada est la seule institution à opérer actuellement des réalisations de télévision sur l'échelle nationale nous croyons que les annonciers ont le droit d'obtenir une certaine publicité pour leurs produits, et que pour le moment

L-278

Radio-Canada pourrait maintenir sa publicité nationale et se limiter à celle-là et se retirer de la publicité du champ local le plus vite et le plus complètement possible, surtout là où il y a des problèmes de concurrence avec les postes privés.

M. TURCOTTE: Vous parlez de télévision?

M. RYAN: Des deux.

M. TURCOTTE: Dans le domaine de la radio, je crois que Radio-Canada ne prend pas de publicité locale.

M. RYAN: A la télévision, oui. Alors ça s'appliquerait seulement à la télévision.

Les stations privées: D'abord, l'octroi des permis devrait continuer, à notre point de vue, devrait se faire qu'après recommandation et étude du Bureau des Gouverneurs de Radio-Canada; et même nous irions jusqu'à croire qu'il serait préférable qu'ils fussent octroyés directement par le Bureau des Gouverneurs. Autrement il y a des possibilités d'ingérence politique. Les cas se sont présentés au cours de la dernière ou l'avant-dernière année dans une région du pays.

M. TURCOTTE: Vous voudriez soustraire l'émission des permis par le Ministère du Transport et les laisser entre les mains du Bureau des Gouverneurs uniquement, exclusivement?

L-279

M. RYAN: C'est ce qui est demandé ici :"Il serait même plus normal que les permis soient octroyés par le Bureau des Gouverneurs..." Ici, nous comparons non pas avec le Ministère du Transport mais avec le Gouverneur en Conseil. C'est entendu qu'il faudrait la permission du Ministère des Transports pour la partie technique. De ce côté-là nous n'avons pas poussé trop loin nos investigations, nous ne voulons pas de changement. C'est parce que les permis sont décernés sur décision du Cabinet. Ca nous apparaît assez dangereux par moment. Nous ne disons pas qu'il est arrivé beaucoup d'abus mais c'est une position de principe. Nous croyons que ce serait plus sûr si c'était entre les mains du Bureau des Gouverneurs.

Me deGRANDPRE: Toujours dans cette question de principe, est-ce que vous ne trouvez pas qu'étant donné que Radio-Canada a, un certain moment, intérêt, qui est l'intérêt public en général, si vous voulez, de faire des objections au Département des Transports pour l'obtention d'un permis ou l'augmentation de puissance d'un poste, sans que les intéressés puissent avoir l'opportunité d'être présents lors des discussions, est-ce que vous ne croyez pas que principe pour principe on tombe dans un danger, et qu'il n'est pas préférable d'avoir un corps qui soit complètement détaché de Radio-Canada et des postes privés pour étudier les

demandes, et que les demandes étant adressées à ce corps ou à ces délégués, si vous voulez, du Département des Transports comme il nous a été suggéré hier, les représentations soient faites par le proposant, les objections soient faites par Radio-Canada, si le proposant n'est pas Radio-Canada, par le public en général et que subséquemment vous ayez la décision d'un délégué du Département des Transports ou d'un groupe de délégués, si vous voulez, du Département des Transports?

M. LAVOIE : Il y a peut-être un danger de ce côté-là, je dirais un danger théorique, mais je pense que si on va un plus loin vous allez constater qu'on recommande un droit d'appel des décisions prises par le Bureau des Gouverneurs en ce qui regarde les postes privés. Or ce droit d'appel-là peut justement donner l'assurance de couvrir des cas qui peuvent se présenter, où des postes privés peuvent se penser lésés par une décision du Bureau des Gouverneurs.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous croyez qu'un tribunal judiciaire soit en mesure d'être l'autorité suprême et compétente pour discuter de problèmes qui sont souvent des problèmes excessivement techniques?

M. LAVOIE: Je pense que nous autres, on parle tout simplement d'un droit d'appel; on n'a

pas établi les statuts. Dans le cas de la Cour d'Echiquier on en donnait la raison.

M. BERUBE: Il y a une recommandation qui peut être antérieure à celle que mentionne monsieur Lavoie. Nous demandons pour les postes privés, sous une forme que nous n'avons pas déterminée, une représentation au Bureau des Gouverneurs pour justement éviter que ces choses-là soient discutées lorsqu'eux autres ne sont pas là. Nous ne voyons pas d'objection à ce qu'ils y soient, étant donné que c'est une affaire d'intérêt public; nous trouvons que ça serait excellent. Ca serait le premier curatif pour le danger que vous mentionnez.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous croyez que le rôle du Bureau des Gouverneurs c'est de représenter à la fois Radio-Canada comme entreprise de diffusion et les postes privés comme entreprises de diffusion, ou si ce n'estpas plutôt le fait du Bureau des Gouverneurs de représenter le public qui entend, qui écoute et qui voit les émissions? Est-ce qu'il n'y a pas une confusion de buts, si vous voulez, entre ce que vous proposez et ce qui doit être dans l'esprit général, que le Bureau des Gouverneurs doit représenter dix provinces à l'écoûte, de façon à orienter le contexte des programmes, la nature des programmes, alors que vous voulez en faire ici un bureau de ceux qui font les émissions. Est-ce qu'on ne change pas du tout au tout le concept du Bureau des Gouverneurs?

M. BRUNELLE: Il a été conçu par les gens qui ont au moins étudié ce mémoire-là et l'ont accepté. Le Bureau des Gouverneurs avait au moins un droit de regard sur les activités de Radio-Canada. C'est le droit de regard que nous demandons d'étendre jusqu'à l'administration des postes privés à travers d'une représentation des postes privés sur le Bureau des Gouverneurs.

Me deGRANDPRE: Le problème que j'y vois, M. Brunelle, c'est que vous changez le concept du Bureau des Gouverneurs et vous en faites un Bureau des Gouverneurs constitué de radiodiffuseurs au lieu d'être un Bureau des Gouverneurs constitué du public en général.

RVD PERE TOUPIN: Il me semble que d'après la loi en particulier, le Bureau des Gouverneurs n'a pas pour but de représenter le public. C'est lui qui dirige le régime, en ce moment, de la radiodiffusion; du moins c'est un peu mon idée.

Me deGRANDPRE: Dans l'orientation générale du système.

RVD PERE TOUPIN: Le directeur général lui-même a en somme assez peu de choses à faire au Bureau des Gouverneurs. Je ne sais pas quel est son rôle.

Me deGRANDPRE: Evidemment, il y a peut-être confusion dans l'esprit général, mais

Radio-Canada n'est pas représentée sur le Bureau des Gouverneurs comme telle.

M. RYAN: Le Bureau des Gouverneurs est Radio-Canada. C'est comme ça qu'elle est définie dans la loi.

Me deGRANDPRE: Etant donné le système que nous avons.

M. RYAN: Oui, mais c'est justement; si c'est un système mixte nous trouvons que ça devrait se réfléter jusqu'à l'échelon de la direction. Actuellement ce n'est pas le cas. Je crois que c'est une source des difficultés actuelles. Nous ne prétendons pas que notre suggestion réglerait tout, mais cette loi-là, d'ailleurs, a été conçue lorsqu'elle a été mise en force, si mes souvenirs sont bons, en fonction des opérations dans lesquelles le gouvernement voulait s'engager.

Me deGRANDPRE: Dans une certaine mesure, oui; mais je pense bien...

M. RYAN: C'est tellement vrai qu'au début on parlait même que la Société Radio-Canada ferait l'acquisition de tous les postes privés qui existaient. Nous croyons que ceux qui exploitent des postes privés demeurent quand même un élément important de la population, et même si on devait concevoir le Bureau des Gouverneurs comme représentant

du public, s'il y avait un élément sur 12 ou 15 ou 16, représentant les postes privés,- sous une forme qui serait à préciser,- ça ne changerait pas l'équilibre général. De toute manière, dansun organisme comme lui-là, on demeure dans le domaine du relatif. Un principe pur est toujours difficile à appliquer littéralement.

M. BRUNELLE: Sans vouloir mélanger la considération légale sur le statut de Radio-Canada même, je pense qu'on peut constater que du côté postes privés ces gens-là donnent un peu l'impression d'être un peu suspendus entre ciel et terre, sans accès à un point de vue d'ensemble sur leurs propres activités comparées aux activités de Radio-Canada.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous voudriez trouver une formule qui collerait un peu plus près les activités des postes privés sur cet organisme d'Etat. Vous suggérez une façon, mais ce qui vous intéresse c'est de leur faire réaliser leur coopération dans l'ensemble de l'organisation du pays?

M. BRUNELLE: C'est ça. C'est l'unité organique du régime national.

M. RYAN: On suggère que, dans l'émission ou le renouvellement de permis, l'autorité compétente tienne davantage compte des facteurs suivants: services réels rendus à la communauté locale; observance des règlements de la diffusion; tenue

générale des programmes; dangers des situations de monopole en ce domaine.

Maintenant, au sujet de la constitution des postes privés en réseaux. Nous croyons qu'en ce qui concerne les réseaux permanents de postes privés, Radio-Canada devrait garder toute juridiction sur la constitution de tels réseaux. Maintenant, nous trouvons un peu curieux qu'une grande réclame ait été faite autour de l'impossibilité où sont les postes privés, parce que l'étude du compte-rendu du comité parlementaire de la diffusion nous a révélé que l'Association des diffuseurs privés n'étaient pas tellement intéressée elle-même à préconiser cette question-là, pas plustard que l'an dernier.

En ce qui concerne les réseaux occasionnels, nous aimerions que Radio-Canada favorise le plus possible, et, au besoin par une certaine aide financière, la constitution, entre postes privés, de réseaux occasionnels pouvant servir à la réalisation de l'un ou l'autre des objectifs du régime national, à savoir avance de l'esprit canadien et éducation populaire et de maintenir la règle actuelle interdisant l'affiliation directe d'un poste privé à un réseau étranger.

Relations avec Radio-Canada: D'abord le service distinct avec les postes privés, nous en avons parlé plus tôt.

L'application des règlements: nous trouvons qu'elle est actuellement, au point de vue surveillance, trop relâchée, trop faiblement organisée pour être réellement efficace. Nous demandons à ce sujet, la mise sur pied d'un personnel suffisant et compétent qui pourra assurer l'audition et le visionnement d'une proportion raisonnable des émissions. Un simple examen périodique des "journaux" d'émissions fourni chaque semaine par les stations privées est inadéquat et inefficace.

Nous suggérons différentes mesures pour l'intégration libre et positive des stations privées dans le régime national. Par exemple, que Radio-Canada continue à fournir aux postes privés affiliés à l'un ou l'autre des cinq réseaux, des émissions de bonne tenue culturelle. Sans que cela implique des concessions regrettables sur sur les normes culturelles, nous croyons qu'il serait avantageux de consulter davantage les postes bénéficiaires sur la nature et la proportion des émissions qui doivent leur être fournies.

Deuxièmement, que Radio-Canada étudie la possibilité de mettre sur pied, de temps à autre, des émissions spécialement destinées à des postes privés non affiliés aux réseaux. Ce serait là une politique de bonne volonté de la part de l'élément principal du régime national.

Que Radio-Canada mette aussi à la disposition des stations privées certains avantages

ou résultats des "Services Auxiliaires" mentionnés au chapitre III : bibliothèque, discothèque, cinémathèque, enquêtes du bureau des sondages, matériel documentaire. Une telle politique serait dans la ligne de la collaboration essentielle préconisée par Radio-Canada dans son mémoire à la Commission Royale.

Nous ne croyons pas que les postes privés soient équipés pour se donner un bureau de recherches et sondages de la qualité de celui qu'aurait éventuellement Radio-Canada. Si de ce côté-là il y avait une très grande facilité de communication, ça contribuerait beaucoup à enrichir la contribution des postes privés.

Aide financière à certains postes nécessaires: Nous croyons que Radio-Canada ne devrait pas hésiter à fournir une certaine aide financière à des postes privés remplissant, dans certaines régions du pays, une fonction indispensable mais coûteuse qui devrait normalement être déjà remplie par Radio-Canada. Nous signalons en particulier le cas des postes de langue française de l'Ouest du pays: le financement de ces postes à même des contributions bénévoles épargna des millions de dollars à l'Etat, mais ce dernier devrait normalement assumer maintenant une partie des frais de fonctionnement de ces stations. Que la Société Radio-Canada, soucieuse d'éviter le pater-

nalisme culturel, devrait étudier la possibilité d'aider financièrement certains postes privés à réaliser eux-mêmes des programmes de haute tenue culturelle ou éducative.

On prévoit des rencontres ou des journées d'études avec les représentants des postes privés pour mettre en commun les expériences et les problèmes.

Qu'on supprime les sources de concurrence sur le terrain de la réclame commerciale, comme nous l'avons dit tantôt; qu'on maintienne un droit d'appel des décisions du Bureau des Gouverneurs et que chaque année le Bureau des Gouverneurs produise, par l'intermédiaire du Parlement, un rapport public sur la situation et la marche générale de l'ensemble des stations privées.

Finalement, deux recommandations, à la fin, en ce qui concerne le personnel. Nous comprenons que le problème du personnel c'est vraiment l'épine dorsale d'un régime national de diffusion qui soit vraiment à la hauteur des objectifs qui lui ont été assignés. Nous constatons que, de ce côté ça s'est développé tellement vite qu'il a fallu improviser sur le tas non seulement des dizaines mais des centaines de membres nouveaux du personnel non seulement à Radio-Canada mais dans les postes privés.

L-289

Pour remédier à la situation nous formulons deux recommandations:

1- Que, dans le plein respect de la juridiction provinciale en matière d'éducation formelle, les autorités de Radio-Canada et les divers éléments du régime national étudient, de concert avec les universités et les grandes sociétés bénévoles, lespossibilités de collaborer à la mise sur pied de services adéquats de formation pour le personnel, actuel et futur, de la radio et de la télévision.

2- Que le Bureau des Gouverneurs mette chaque année, a la disposition d'un nombre égal d'officiers ou d'employés de Radio-Canada et des postes privés, une certaine quantité de bourses d'études destinées à favoriser des échanges avec les sytèmes radiophoniques de pays étrangers ou des séjours dans des centres universaires ou services spécialisés de recherches .

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Ryan. It is a very interesting and comprehensive brief, and we are grateful to you and your organization for the trouble you have taken to study the question and put it forward so clearly and in such detail.

Mr. deGRANDPRE, you have some questions additional to those we have asked as we went along?

Mr. DeGRANDPRE: Yes, I have a few, Mr. Chairman.

L-290

Me deGRANDPRE: Je pense qu'étant donné la masse des recommandations, que la façon la plus simple serait de passer à travers le mémoire de nouveau avec vous et de discuter de certains points pour obtenir des clarifications.

A la page 7, par exemple, au haut de la page, vous dites que vous avez reçu une collaboration de la Société Radio-Canada. Est-ce que je dois comprendre que vous avez également reçu de la collaboration des postes privés, là où vous vous êtes adressés ou si vous ne vous êtes pas adressés aux postes privés?

M. RYAN: Je crois que c'est une question intéressante que vous soulevez là. Je dois dire d'abord que les postes privés ne sont pas dans la même situation financière que Radio-Canada pour envisager une coopération avec des organismes comme les nôtres. Je dirais également qu'ils se sont éveillés de date assez récente. Je soulignerai que lors de la préparation de notre mémoire, nous sommes allés consulter les dirigeants de postes privés pour être sûrs d'avoir leur point de vue au complet. Nous avons envisagé des projets de coopération pour les années à venir. Nous sommes allés d'abord là où la porte était la plus ouverte.

Me deGRANDPRE: Etant donné qu'il s'agit là d'un problème de finance, est-ce qu'ily a des objections de principe ou simplement des

objections pratiques à la vente des programmes? Est-ce qu'en principe la Société s'objecte à ce que les commanditaires soutiennent les programmes de la Société sinon totalement du moins en partie, parce que je comprends que certains de vos programmes ont un "rating" assez haut. Alors, étant donné que l'annonceur est intéressé à atteindre une partie substantielle de la population, si le programme, tout en étant un programme strictement éducatif, est un programme qui attire l'auditeur, est-ce que la Société a des objections de principe à ce que le programme soit commandité?

M. BRUNELLE: La question, à ma connaissance, n'a jamais été considérée à cause du caractère de certaines émissions, du moins parmi celles que nous faisons. Je crois qu'il est très bon de ménager l'objectivité complète vis-à-vis les gens qui réalisent le programme, ça veut dire que ce n'est pas facile d'envisager que certains programmes ou certaines émissions soient commandités.

Me deGRANDPRE: Les programmes de discussion?

M. BRUNETTE: La question n'a même jamais été discutée à ma connaissance au bureau de direction. De prime abord, il paraît surprenant qu'un programme comme "Les idées en marche" soit commandité.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je dois vous dire que les nouvelles de Radio-Canada ne sont jamais commanditées. Les nouvelles de tous les postes privés sont commanditées. Les représentations jusqu'à date, je pense, sans aucune exception, ont démontré que le commanditaire n'influençait en aucune façon le contenu des nouvelles. Et comme question de fait, on nous a cité un exemple que le commanditaire d'un programme de nouvelles dans l'Ouest était une compagnie de farine et que la première nouvelle qui a paru sur les ondes le matin par cette compagnie de farine, c'était une nouvelle quant à des procédures ou une enquête en vertu de la Loi des combines contre le trust de la farine.

M. BRUNELLE: Les remarques que je viens de faire n'affectent aucunement l'objectivité des compagnies qui pourraient être en cause; personnellement, je considère qu'il est difficile de faire commanditer certains programmes par des compagnies commerciales.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous y verriez presqu'une objection de principe à ce que ça soit commandité?

M. BRUNELLE: Je n'ai pas d'objection de principe mais pour le moment je considère que c'est difficile d'admettre la situation.

M. BRETON: Pour revenir à votre ques-

tion initiale, je crois que la Société comme telle n'a pas fait souvent appel à la collaboration des postes privés, mais chacun de nos organismes-membres souvent font appel aux postes privés et nous avons une bonne collaboration et ils seraient prêts certainement à prendre plus que ce que nous pouvons leur offrir.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, c'est un domaine technique dans lequel, je présume, vous n'avez pas d'expérience personnelle, mais quant au sujet du nombre limité de canaux... Nous avons eu hier un mémoire qui nous a indiqué qu'aux Etats-Unis, à l'heure actuelle, il y a 359 canaux de télévision, et si on peut en installer le même nombre au Canada je ne crois pas qu'on puisse considérer que c'est un domaine où c'est tellement limité. Etant donné que vous en faites un principe de base, est-ce que vous auriez des commentaires à ce sujet-là ou si vous croyez que c'est peut-être pas limité quant au nombre mais c'est limité quant au point de vue économique pour le Canada.

M. RYAN: Ici, nous nous sommes reposés sur le témoignage des techniciens du Ministère du Transport devant le comité de la diffusion. Leur témoignage a été assez catégorique dans ce sens-là. Je crois, si mes souvenirs sont bons, qu'il y aurait beaucoup plus de canaux de disponibles pour le Canada, mais plus au nord, là où la population n'est pas

dense, parce que la population, je dirais, est répartie tout le long dans une ligne de cent milles du long de la frontière américaine qui fait que les canaux se rencontrent, se voisinent et parfois s'entrecroisent. Je pense que c'est là l'explication de leur position. Nous avons lu le mémoire des diffuseurs privés qui invoquent les milliers de fréquences qui seraient disponibles. En théorie c'est vrai; mais dans la pratique actuelle, étant donné les facteurs sociologiques et culturels qui jouent, ça ne semble pas être vrai.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, quant au problème des réseaux, vous avez à plusieurs reprises dans votre mémoire indiqué la nécessité d'un rapprochement entre les postes privés d'une part et la radio d'Etat d'autre part, et également la nécessité de développer des programmes régionaux. En regard de ces deux problèmes que vous mentionnez, est-ce qu'il n'y aurait pas lieu dans l'esprit de votre Société d'autoriser la formation de réseaux privés sur une base régionale, ou êtes-vous opposés à la formation de tout réseau en marge de Radio-Canada, de façon à laisser le contrôle exclusif des réseaux à la Société d'Etat?

M. RYAN: La position qui est prise dans le mémoire c'est que la constitution des réseaux occasionnels est une affaire très désirable. La constitution de réseaux permenents devrait être

au Bureau des Gouverneurs, conçu un peu dans la ligne que vous avez suggérée. Par conséquent, ça pourrait très bien envisager des chaînes de postes régionaux, mais à condition que là ça ne verse pas dans le monopole. Vous savez comme moi que dans beaucoup d'endroits il y a une menace de monopole, si on insiste trop sur les régionaux. Si on arrive à un moment donné où une famille va contrôler les airs pour toute une résion géographique du Canada c'est peut-être assez dangereux. Il y aurait ce facteur-là à considérer. Moyennant des assurances raisonnables de ce côté-là, je ne crois pas qu'il y aurait d'objection spécialement dans le but d'obtenir des émissions plus régionales qu'à l'heure actuelle

Maintenant, il faut vous dire une chose: c'est un problème de réseaux, - et ce sont des dirigeants qui nous ont rapporté ça - mais je crois que c'est très important dans l'évolution de la situation actuelle de la diffusion au pays. Il y a eu des expériences qui ont été tentées dans la province de Québec au point de vue réseaux sur le plan français, postes privés. On a essayé d'avoir des émissions de meilleure qualité culturelle. Un moment donné, si mes informations sont exactes, on demandait $5.00 pour une émission d'un quart d'heure aux postes qui voudraient bénéficier de l'émission, et la plupart des postes se sont désistés parce qu'ils trouvaient que c'était trop dispendieux. Il faudrait tenir compte de ça aussi. C'est

pour ça que nous ne nous avançons pas trop dans cette direction-là parce que les faits portés à notre connaissance n'étaient pas très suggestifs.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, à la page 10 de votre mémoire, au premier paragraphe, votre dernière phrase se termine comme ceci: "On devrait tendre à intégrer davantage dans les objectifs et la vie du régime national pour qu'ils s'y sentent vraiment des associés". Vous faites référence aux postes privés. Est-ce que, pour arriver à ce but-là, vous n'avez pas que la suggestion que vous avez faite tout à l'heure, de leur donner une représentation sur le Bureau des Gouverneurs ou si vous avez encore plusieurs autres suggestions que vous voudriez faire ressortir?

M. RYAN: Il y en a d'autres aux pages 24 et 25 de notre mémoire. Par exemple, améliorer encore la politique de Radio-Canada consistant à fournir des programmes. Actuellement les stations dans les régions urbaines, ces stations marginales dont nous parlions, ne recoivent rien de Radio-Canada parce que les services de Radio-Canada vont à ses postes affiliés. Si parfois il s'inaugurait une politique de coopération avec des postes qui ne sont pas affiliés...

Me deGRANDPRE: Quel serait l'avantage que deux ou trois postes, par exemple, à Montréal,

transmettent le même programme produit par Radio-Canada, au même moment?

M. RYAN: Ca pourrait être un programme distinct qui ne serait pas transmis sur le poste CBF à ce moment-là.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous envisagez la possibilité que Radio-Canada devienne un centre de production de plusieurs programmes au même moment ou que des programmes déjà passés soient relégués sur fil à des postes non affiliés à certaines autres heures de la semaine.

M. RYAN: C'a déjà été tenté sur le plan anglais.

M. BRUNELLE: Il n'est pas impossible de penser que la collaboration serait non seulement au niveau des programmes mais aussi financière, et que la capacité de production de Radio-Canada soit mise à contribution, au profit et de Radio-Canada et des postes privés.

M. RYAN; Parce qu'actuellement les postes privés nous disent :"Donnez-nous le budget de Radio-Canada pour réaliser "Les Idées en Marche", on va coopérer avec vous autres cent pour cent". Maintenant, nous n'avons pas le budget. Je n'ai pas vu les états financiers de ces postes-là, Vous autres, vous aurez ce privilège-là; mais ça reste une question ouverte.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, à la page 11 vous suggérez l'abandon de la politique actuelle d'un canal unique et vous le suggérez particulièrement pour les grandes villes. L'objection qu'on a formulée devant nous à l'heure actuelle, c'est que si un deuxième canal est octroyé, les forces économiques vont être telles qu'il y aura inévitablement une importation de programmes américains. Est-ce que vous ne considérez pas que c'est précisément dans les grandes villes que l'influence américaine se fait le plus sentir et que c'est à l'endroit faible de notre résistance, si vous voulez, que vous suggérez l'inauguration d'un second canal?

M. BERUBE: Je pense que la situation est inverse et qu'à l'heure actuelle, si on parle de Québec en particulier, on a un poste privé qui fait de l'importation assez régulièrement. Alors, on suggère qu'un poste d'échange pourrait être un remède à cette situation-là.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et pour Montréal, la situation est clairement l'inverse.

M. RYAN: Il ne faut pas non plus organiser des réserves culturelles absolument fermées. Pourvu que le peuple fait sa part par la voix d'un régime national, c'est son élément principal. Aussi, quand il y a possibilité de choix; on ne peut pas vivre voisins des Américains en érigeant des clôtures culturelles trop rigides. De ce côté-là il faut s'attendre

qu'il y aura plus de matière américaine qui va venir par un poste privé. Si des règlements sérieux sont élaborés et appliqués et qu'une coopération plus organique existe entre ces postes privés et Radio-Canada, nous croyons que ça sera relativement mieux que ce que nous aurions autrement.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous entrevoyez une réglementation pour prévenir une importation trop grande ou si vous laissriez ça au libre choix des radiodiffuseurs privés?

M. RYAN: Nous en parlons dans le mémoire quelque part. Il faudrait y avoir un pourcentage peut-être plus élevé d'émissions originales du pays même. On a constaté, je crois, sur le plan de la radio -- vous me corrigerez si je suis inexact -- qu'il n'existe aucun pourcentage minimum actuellement établi par le Bureau des Gouverneurs pour la diffusion d'émissions en direct ou d'origine canadienne. Par conséquent, un poste privé pourrait diffuser 90 pour cent d'émissions radiophoniques télévisées originales des Etats-Unis. Je ne crois pas qu'il existe de règlements. De ce côté-là il pourrait y avoir une réglementation minimum, en deça de laquelle un poste ne serait pas dans la bonne voie. Pas trop haut non plus, de manière à leur rendre les opérations impossibles.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est dans ce sens-là que je pose la question. Si l'on fait ça par voie

L-300

de réglementation il faudra, je pense, à peu près inévitablement, que la réglementation s'applique à peu près à tous les postes; et ce qui pourrait être une bonne proportion dans les grands centres pourrait être une mauvaise proportion dans un petit centre ou à l'inverse. Est-ce que, au lieu d'avoir une réglementation assez rigide, vous ne laisseriez pas un pouvoir plus discrétionnaire au Bureau des Gouverneurs? Evidemment, toujours en considérant la possibilité de ce droit d'appel pour faire rectifier les injustices qui pourraient peut-être s'y glisser?

M. BRUNELLE: On fait confiance dans ce domaine-là au Bureau des Gouverneurs.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, vous suggérez à la page 12, que le réseau français particulièrement soit continué et agrandi. Evidemment, dans ce domaine-là, il y a des restrictions financières qui s'imposent. Est-ce que dans l'esprit de votre Société il est plus urgent de compléter le réseau de télévision que de compléter le réseau de la radio, ou si vous verriez d'abord un réseau complet de radio et ensuite un développement du réseau de télévision? Nous avons eu les deux points de vue quand nous sommes allés dans l'Ouest et dans les Maritimes.

RVD PERE TOUPIN: Je me demande si les points de vue sont nécessairement opposés.

L-301

Me deGRANDPRE: Ils sont opposés dans le temps.

RVD PERE TOUPIN: Il est possible, évidemment, qu'il y ait des points de vue opposés. Ces choses-là, c'est discutable; il y a du pour et du contre, mais dans la pratique ordinairement on trouve un compromis. Il peut arriver qu'à tel endroit il est impossible d'avoir la télévision mais il est possible d'avoir un poste de relais de radio, et ce serait très utile. En somme il faut juger chaque circonstance. On ne peut pas avoir un point de vue absolu dans un sens ou dans l'autre. Il faut que Radio-Canada se développe, développe ses deux services et aille au plus pressé. On peut se demander justement si des postes de relais dans nos milieux de langue française ne rendraient pas service et si ça serait véritablement tellement dispendieux. Ce sont des questions techniques que je ne puis pas résoudre moi-même. Il existe beaucoup de ces postes de relais dans des très petits centres de l'Ontario du Nord, de langue anglaise, en Colombie Britannique, même pour quelques milliers de personnes. Par contre nous avons des groupes français très nombreux et nous n'avons pas de ces postes de relais-là.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous songez particulièrement aux groupes qui sont dans les Maritimes, je présume?

RVD PERE TOUPIN: Moi, je suis de l'Ontario. Il y a des groupes dans les Maritimes. On parle

de certains secteurs de l'Ontario. Vous avez la région de Welland, par exemple, où un poste de relais pourrait desservir en atteignant peut-être jusqu'à Toronto, où il y a au moins 100,000 personnes d'origine française et qui parlent le français, qui peuvent au moins entendre le français. Dans la région de Windsor, vous obtiendriez un groupe d'une cinquantaine de mille allant jusqu'à Sarnia.

M. RYAN: Comme la région de Rivière-la-Paix en Alberta. Actuellement le poste d'Edmonton ne peut pas se rendre là. Ca demanderait une installation technique trop dispendieuse que le poste actuel ne peut pas assumer. S'il y avait un poste de relais, il y a quandmême plusieurs milliers de Canadiens de langue française dans cette région-là qui en bénéficieraient.

M. TURCOTTE: Les postes de relais ont un rayonnement extrêmement faible, d'une douzaine de milles seulement. Dans une région comme Rivière-la-Paix, où je suppose l'élément de langue française est très dispersé, je crois que le poste de relais serait à peine une solution au problème.

M. RYAN: Ils sont concentrés dans une douzaine de paroisses, et la grande majorité, s'il y a deux ou trois postes de relais, ils pourraient donner un rendement très satisfaisant. Il y en a d'autres qui sont beaucoup plus loin, mais la majorité, ils sont dans une douzaine de paroisses,

autour de Falaise, je crois. Je suis allé moi-Même récemment et j'ai fait mon observation là-dessus.

M. TURCOTTE: Quel est le nombre approximatif des Canadiens de langue française, dans ce coin-là?

M. RYAN: Peut-être une douzaine de mille.

RVD PERE TOUPIN: Une fois rendu sur les lieux, avoir 2 ou 3 postes de relais, ça ne doit pas coûter beaucoup plus cher parce que c'est le transport, paraît-il, qui coûte cher.

Me deGRANDPRE: A la page 21, vous suggérez que les licences soient accordées pour une période de cinq ans. Est-ce que ce n'est pas ce qui existe à l'heure actuelle, aux termes du paragraphe 5 (2) des règlements qui ont été adoptés conformément à la loi de la radio. J'ai le texte anglais ici :"Provided that for such stations the license may be continued in force for further period of five years". Il ne s'agit pas là de changement?

M. TURCOTTE: J'aurais simplement une petite question à vous poser. Vous faites allusion à la radio et à la télévision à la page 14, et vous dites en autre chose que nonobstant la popularité phénoménale de la télévision il ne faudrait pas reléguer la radio au rôle de parent pauvre. Je sais bien que votre Société représente à peu près tous les éléments de la population. Avez-vous des indices

que l'intérêt des auditeurs dans la radio décline de plus en plus, ou croyez-vous que c'est arrivé à un palier maintenant où nous pouvons espérer que cela va se maintenir au niveau actuel ou que la télévision va remplacer complètement la radio? Au cours des années, bien entendu, puisqu'il s'agit de moyens techniques. En d'autres termes, est-ce que la radio perd tellement de popularité qu'il n'est pas indiqué qu'il faut la négliger un peu?

M. RYAN: C'est une vocation qui s'ouvre à la radio à la suite du développement de la télévision. Les enquêtes aux Etats-Unis ont montré que la radio était encore énormément écoutée. Les observations que nous avons de ce côté-là -- nous n'avons pas d'enquête scientifique, malheureusement pour parler avec certitude -- qui nous indiquent que les possibilités sont encore très grandes. Si on prend, par exemple, c'est un fait général,- la vente des appareils de radio l'an dernier, au Canada, a beaucoup augmentée. Les gens doivent les acheter pour s'en servir. Maintenant, c'est sûr que le soir la grande majorité de la population, là où elle peut en disposer, va du côté de la télévision plutôt que du côté de la radio; ça, c'est sûr.

M. TURCOTTE: La soirée serait plutôt une période creuse pour la radio?

M. RYAN: Oui, c'est l'avis de tous ceux qui sont dans le domaine.

M. TURCOTTE: C'est votre observation per-

sonnelle aussi, j'imagine, dans les milieux familiaux?

M. RYAN: Je pense que M. Bérubé nous avait communiqué certaines observations quand nous avons étudié le projet. Par exemple, nous autres, on se disait qu'il y aurait moyen de songer à beaucoup de types d'émissions pendant le jour pour tempérer un peu le fait des émissions de chansonnettes qui entrent dans la plupart des foyers. S'il y avait des émissions de caractère plus adapté, par exemple, pour la ménagère, il y aurait sûrement moyen d'envisager des émissions utiles et agréables en même temps. Il y en a déjà quelques-unes, mais encore de ce côté-là il y a des possibilités énormes.

M. TURCOTTE: Il faut que ce soit de caractère musical, autrement ce sont les romans-savon qui doivent prendre la place, puisqu'on peut les écouter de loin.

M. RYAN: Oui.

M. TURCOTTE: En d'autres termes, vous envisageriez plutôt une orientation nouvelle de la radio, repenser tout le problème afin de ne pas perdre sa clientèle et de combler les heures qui ne sont pas remplies par la télévision?

M. RYAN: Si la Commission royale pouvait nous proposer une réponse à ces questions-là...

M. TURCOTTE: Au contraire; c'est au

public que nous demandons de nous indiquer des idées.

M. RYAN: Nous autres, de ce côté-là, on pourrait faire beaucoup plus. Nous avons un comité de la radio qui étudie ces problèmes-là. Malheureusement, dans les limites budgétaires où nous évoluons actuellement, c'est un domaine sur lequel il n'a pas été possible de faire une enquête systématique. Si c'était possible dans les mois à venir, ça serait une bien bonne chose. Si ça pouvait rendre service on le ferait volontiers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you again for your brief. There are many more questions we might ask you, but I think we have pretty well covered the main points you have raised. I repeat what I said before, we appreciate the trouble you have taken to prepare this and submit it to us. We have one more brief to hear this morning, La Chambre de Commerce des Jeunes.

- - - - - - - - - - -

L-307

Montréal, 14 septembre 1956

Mémoire soumis par

LA FEDERATION DES CHAMBRES DE COMMERCE DES JEUNES DE LA PROVINCE DE QUENEC .

Présents:

| | |
|---|---|
| M. Jean-Louis Cousineau | M. Charles Blais |
| M. Georges Dastous | M. Martin |
| M. Maurice Lavallée | M. Thomas Giroux |

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is that of La Fédération des Chambres de Commerce des Jeunes de la Province de Québec. We will mark it as Exhibit No. 195.

EXHIBIT No. 195 : Submission by La Fédération des Chambres de Commerce des Jeunes de la Province de Québec.

I should say this, Mr. Cousineau that my colleague Mr.Stewart may have to leave before we can finish. If he does you will understand it, and he will be able to follow what is said, in the transcript later. Would you be able to summarize this for us.

M. JEAN-LOUIS COUSINEAU: Monsieur le président, si vous le permettez, je vous présenterai avant les collègues qui m'accompagnent. Vousavez ici, à ma gauche, M. Georges Dastous, qui est notre secrétaire-gérant à la Fédération; M. Maurice

Lavallée, qui est vice-président exécutif et qui habite Pierreville; nous avons M. Charles Blais, de Québec, qui est vice-président provincial; M. Martin, d'Amos, vice-président provincial; M. Thomas Giroux, aviseur technique.

THE CHAIRMAN: You know our procedure here -- summarizing and then questions.

M. COUSINEAU. Yes. Monsieur le président, de toute façon notre mémoire est assez court et assez catégorique. Je voulais tout simplement, au début, signaler comment est composée la Fédération des Chambres de Commerce des Jeunes de la Province de Québec. Dans tout le Canada nous avons des Chambres, et les Chambres françaises sont groupées en fédération. Nous représntons actuellement environ 10,000 membres, et dans les cadres des Chambres des Jeunes il n'y a pas uniquement des jeunes hommes d'affaires: il y a également des professionnels, des industriels, des marchands, des techniciens, des artisans et des journaliers. C'est vous dire que l'expression d'opinion que nous faisons aujourd'hui représente assez bien la pensée de la jeunesse actuelle dans la province de Québec.

Tout d'abord, nous tenons à signaler que nous n'avons pas la prétention de vous parler à titre d'experts. Nous sommes venus ici tout simplement pour vous exposer notre point de vue sans nous attaquer à l'aspect technique et sans nous attaquer

également au système de financement. Nous n'avons pas actuellement les moyens de faire une étude sérieuse de ces questions et nous laissons aux associations ou aux autorités compétentes le soin de le faire.

Ce que nous avons considéré tout simplement, c'est le principe d'organisation et de fonctionnement de la radio et de la télévision au Canada.

Nous avons, il y a quelques années, dans notre Association, codifié dans un credo les principes de vie que nous croyons être les meilleurs pour le développement général du pays et le dévelppement des individus. Tout notre mémoire est basé sur ce credo, et nous tenons à signaler ici que le texte français est le texte officiel. Nous avons constaté à la suite de l'impression que la traduction dans certains cas ne donnait pas exactement le sens du texte français. Si vous voulez nous pouvons faire les corrections immédiatement ou vous les fournir après.

Alors, monsieur le président, si vous le permettez, nous allons tout simplement lire les conclusions ou le sommaire de notre mémoire .

Nous nous permettons, en terminant, de présenter un sommaire de nos propositions:

La Fédération des Chambres de Commerce des jeunes de la Province de Québec est heureuse que cette enquête ait été instituée. Elle répond à un

besoin réel.

La Fédération s'intéresse activement au problème de la radio et de la télévision parce que ce sont deux puissants instruments de formation et parce qu'ils contribuent à mouler le Canada qui sera celui des jeunes hommes d'affaires demain. Ils veulent avoir voix au chapitre.

La radio d'Etat et la radio privée ont toutes deux rendu des services dans le passé. Elles pourront en rendre dans l'avenir mais d'une façon différente.

Elle propose que l'on constitue une Commission Canadienne de Radio et de Télévision qui devra jouer un rôle de réglementation et de contrôle de la nature et de la qualité des émissions, dans le respect des droits constitutionnels des provinces, dans le développement d'une culture véritablement canadienne, c'est-à-dire ayant un caractère de dualité ethnique et différente de l'américaine. Cette commission jouerait somme toute un rôle semblable pour la radio et la télévision à celui de la Commission des Transports pour les chemins de fer.

Elle propose que Radio-Canada vende tous ses postes de radio et de télévision à l'entreprise privée, sauf celui de Sackville et que cet organisme d'Etat se transforme en un organisme de production.

Enfin elle propose que l'on aide les

postes privés par des subventions indirectes, sous forme de programmes, praticulièrement les postes locaux et régionaux.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Cousineau. We will make our questions fairly short because I know you gentlemen need to get back - or some of you do - I hope you won't think we are shortening them for any other reason.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je voudrais tout simplement poser quelques questions, monsieur le président, quant à cette suggestion. La proposition principale de votre mémoire c'est l'abolition de Radio-Canada comme centre de diffusion de programmes pour que Radio-Canada ne se limite qu'à la production des programmes et voir à la distribution de ceux-ci par l'entremise des postes privés. Je comprends que dans votre esprit vous feriez disparaître complètement le Bureau des Gouverneurs de Radio-Canada.

M. COUSINEAU: C'est-à-dire qu'à ce moment-ci il y a une transformation, si vous voulez, par la création de la Commission canadienne qui est une commission tout à fait autonome. Actuellement le Bureau des Gouverneurs et Radio-Canada sont rattachés. Nous voudrions une commission complètement indépendante. On pourrait l'appeler Bureau des Gouverneurs quand même, mais, enfin ce serait une commission indépendante sur laquelle seraient représentés et Radio-Canada et les postes privés, tous ceux

qui ont intérêt à la radio et à la télévision, sans oublier les provinces lorsqu'il y a matière à éducation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cousineau, you don't contemplate two things: a Board of Governors and a new Commission?

M. COUSINEAU: Un des deux; qu'on l'appelle Bureau des Gouverneurs ou Commission de la radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are only suggesting a change of name?

M. COUSINEAU: Non, pas nécessairement.

THE CHAIRMAN: What I am saying now is this: if you have as you suggest, taken away the station operations from the present Board of Governors of the CBC and you are left then with them as a programme production agency, you do not contemplate having the Board of Governors of CBC and a radio commission?

MR. COUSINEAU: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the functions you list throughout the memorandum as being what this new commission would do are substantially functions which the board of governors today has.

MR. COUSINEAU: Yes, c'est vrai; mais dans le cas actuel, ce que nous suggérons, c'est que

ce soit quelque chose de complètement distinct, qu'il n'y ait pas de rattachement à Radio-Canada; parce que ce qui se produit actuellement et ce que nous n'approuvons pas, c'est que Radio-Canada est à la fois juge et peut-être partie dans une cause. S'il y a un différend, par exemple, entre Radio-Canada et les postes privés, c'est en fin de compte le Bureau des Gouverneurs de Radio-Canada qui doit trancher la question. Or, nous concluons qu'ils sont à la fois juge et partie dans la cause.

Qu'on appelle ça le Bureau des Gouverneurs de la radio et de la télévision canadienne ou la Commission canadienne de radio et de télévision, ça n'a aucune espèce d'importance; mais on veut que ce soit une commission tout à fait distincte et indépendante. Radio-Canada comme l'entreprise privée doivent être soumis à cette commission ou à ce Bureau des gouverneurs, à qui nous donnons deux fonctions: une fonction de réglementation et une fonction de contrôle.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who do you suggest should represent the public interests -- and you are a young business man -- in seeing that CBC is run efficiently - in a businesslike way?

M. COUSINEAU: Voici: A ce moment-là, ce sont deux choses bien distinctes. Radio-Canada devient un organisme comme l'Office National du Film, qui a ses directeurs, enfin une organisation

semblable à ça; mais la Commission c'est toute une autre affaire, comme la Commission des Chemins de fer. Les représentants de cette Commission-là seront nommés par le gouvernement, tâchant de représenter tous les éléments intéressés à ces questions-là. C'est-à-dire que Radio-Canada pourra avoir des représentants sur cette commission, les postes privés aussi; il pourrait y avoir des officiers du gouvernement qui seraient nommés et également lorsqu'il y a une matière à éducation, que les provinces soient représentées de façon à ce que l'on tienne l'équilibre. En fin de compte, c'est un peu un petit parlement qui doit grouper tous les intérêts intéressés dans la question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think I made my questions clear. You are proposing that CBC give up its station operations, leave all the station operations and transmission to the private broadcaster. You are then suggesting that there should be a commission which would be responsible for handling the general operations of the CBC and the private stations making the overall rules and handling the overall control of radio and television in Canada, but you do not say who is to supervise and be responsible in the public interest for the management of CBC as a crown corporation.

M. COUSINEAU: Monsieur le président, de

quelle façon l'Office national du film est-il responsable vis-à-vis le gouvernement?

THE CHAIRMAN: They have a Board, the Film Board, with public representation on it and some civil servants in Ottawa.

M. COUSINEAU: Alors, Radio-Canada pourrait être composée à peu près de la même façon.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you don't say this in your brief.

MR. COUSINEAU: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Because I thought you said that the Board of governors or Board of directors would disappear.

M. COUSINEAU: Voici, monsieur le président: c'est que tout ce qui est matière à radio ou à télévision, tout ce qui relève des ondes pourrait tomber sous le contrôle de la commission. Par exemple, vous avez actuellement popularisation par les voitures de taxi d'utiliser les ondes de radio. Toutes ces questions de transmission par ondes pourraient être sous le contrôle de cette commission.

MR. COMMISSIONER STEWART: In your submission here you propose that the CBC should sell all their stations. Would you propose also that they would continue as a production medium - producing films?

MR. COUSINEAU: Yes.

MR. STEWART: Well, then, there is nothing in your recommendations to say how they are going to get those out. Do you propose that they should sell those to the private stations or that they should rent time from the private stations to put those on the air?

M. COUSINEAU: Voici, monsieur le président. Evidemment, ici, nous entrons un peu dans le domaine technique et je crois bien que nous ne sommes peut-être pas en mesure de vous proposer une solution bien précise étant donné que nous ne sommes pas des experts dans la matière. Mais je suis persuadé que par la commission de contrôle l'on pourra déterminer de quelle façon l'on pourrait procéder et, à ce moment-ci il y a une question d'étape; il ne s'agirait pas d'arriver demain matin et obliger Radio-Canada à vendre ses postes dans les 48 heures; mais je crois bien que l'entreprise privée pourrait petit à petit absorber ces postes-là. Radio-Canada verrait non seulement à produire des programmes sur films mais deviendrait un centre de production qui pourrait conserver justement le caractère canadien et bi-ethnique et favoriser le développement de l'unité canadienne et le développement culturel particulièrement.

De quelle façon exactement nous devrions procéder? Nous ne croyons pas être en mesure de vous

donner une réponse satisfaisante, mais je crois bien qu'avec les équipes qui sont à votre service ou qui le seront dans le futur, vous pourrez arriver à trouver une solution qui donnerait satisfaction à tout le monde.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous considérez que ce centre de production de Radio-Canada devrait être engagé dans tous les domaines de la production ou strictement dans les domaines qui sont des domaines de culture au sens strict du mot?

M. COUSINEAU: Tous les domaines.

Me deGRANDPRE: Radio-Canada produirait 18 heures par jour, si vous voulez ou la longueur totale du nombre d'émissions, et comment Radio-Canada pourrait-elle s'assurer de la transmission de ses programmes?

M. COUSINEAU: Voici, nous disons dans le mémoire, ici :"La commission canadienne de radio et de télévision déterminerait un certain pourcentage des programmes qui devraient être utilisés par les postes d'entreprise privée".

Me deGRANDPRE: Et si ça s'adonne que les postes d'entreprise privée, tout en respectant le pourcentage, se concertent pour ne faire passer que les programmes qu'on appelle communément les programmes populaires qui ont un attrait pour l'auditeur ou pour le spectateur; ça voudrait dire que

Radio-Canada dépenserait pendant le reste de la journée des fonds qui seraient inutilisés?

M. COUSINEAU: Voici, ça tombe encore sous le contrôle de la commission. Je pourrais peut-être vous faire un petit parallèle. Je suis dans l'assurance. Or il y a des lois qui réglementent l'actif des compagnies, le maximum qui doit être placé, par exemple, sur hypothèques, qui peuvent être placés en débentures, qui peuvent être placés dans des emprunts du gouvernement et scolaires; alors, la commission, elle, pourrait avec l'expérience, déterminer soit des catégories de programmes ou des pourcentages à être utilisés.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous admettrez que dans n'importe laquelle de ces hypothèses vous ne pourriez pas forcer les postes privés à ne prendre que ces programmes-là; et aux termes de la réglementation si vous imposez tel programme à tel poste, est-ce qu'il n'y a pas un danger qu'il y ait de la discrimination? Et si vous ne voulez pas discriminer contre tel ou tel poste vous êtes obligé de laisser à tel ou tel poste le libre choix de ses programmes qu'il voudra faire passer sur ses ondes à lui. Est-ce que si vous faites produire toute la journée et si les programmes ne sont pas utilisés que pendant six heures ou sept heures, par exemple, vous ne dépenserez pas les fonds publics pendant dix heures, onze heures ou douze heures, sans que la nation n'en profite en aucune façon?

L-319

M. COUSINEAU: Monsieur, on peut discuter, votre argument est certainement bon, à la condition que vous n'envisagiez pas une commission canadienne de la radio et de la télévision; mais si vous admettez le principe d'une commission canadienne de la radio et de la télévision il va falloir que vous lui déterminiez des pouvoirs.

Me deGRANDPRE: J'admets tout ça.

M. COUSINEAU: Et comme on a dit que la commission canadienne de la radio et de la télévision, telle que nous le pensions, groupait des représentants, de l'entreprise privée et des représentants des provinces surtout quand il s'agissait d'émissions éducatives, il n'y a pas de raison que ces gens-là ne s'entendent pas pour établir une réglementation qui satisferait tout le monde. Et puis, cette condition d'acceptation d'un certain pourcentage de programmes ne serait pas plus sensationnel que celui du Ministère des Postes qui nous défend de mettre plus de 55 pour cent d'annonces dans nos journaux.

Me deGRANDPRE: Ce n'est pas du tout semblable.

M. COUSINEAU: Vous êtes dans l'imprimerie et le ministère des Postes, mais seulement la commission canadienne de la radio et de la télévision pourrait bien demander, faire accepter par les commissaires une réglementation qui les obligeraient, par exemple, de ne pas avoir de commerciaux de sept

heures à minuit le soir. Tout le monde peut s'entendre pour l'accepter.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et cette commission se trouverait à faire à peu près ce que le Bureau des Gouverneurs fait à l'heure actuelle lorsqu'il insiste pour que tel ou tel programme soit passé sur les ondes des postes privés?

M. COUSINEAU: On n'a pas l'impression, en demandant une commission indépendante de la radio, de vouloir dire que le Bureau des Gouverneurs actuellement fait mal tout ce qu'il fait. Ce n'est pas ça qu'on veut dire.

Me deGRANDPRE: La seule différence fondamentale entre la situation actuelle et celle que vous proposez c'est que les postes de Radio-Canada soient vendus au cours d'une période d'années?

M. COUSINEAU: C'est ça; on veut simplement sauver le principe de la libre entreprise. Nous disons que, actuellement, selon la loi actuelle, Radio-Canada n'a pas abusé des pouvoirs qu'elle a eus et qu'elle a de par la loi; mais le simple fait de pouvoir abuser, pour nous autres, c'est mauvais. On veut enlever du contrôle gouvernemental l'information radiodiffusée et télévisée.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous allez en enlever du contrôle si vous êtes obligé de donner des pouvoirs à cette nouvelle commission de contrôler le nombre d'émissions que les postes pri-

vés sont obligés de passer?

M. COUSINEAU: A ce moment-là, votre commission est groupée de tous les éléments et elle est indépendante, elle est autonome; elle n'est pas juge et exécutant en même temps; elle est juge tout simplement, elle contrôle.

THE CHAIRMAN: But how much free enterprise can we afford here. You are suggesting an increase in cost in your suggestion -- are you not?

M. COUSINEAU: Voici, monsieur le président; je crois bien qu'il y a à envisager ceci...

THE CHAIRMAN: May I just explain my question to be sure you understand me. As I take your proposal you are suggesting that the CBC should virtually retire from the commercial field which now produces some millions of dollars a year to help defray its overall expenses. You are also suggesting that it retire from the station operations field, and to the extent that station operations may be profitable you are taking that away, too, although it may be somewhat the same thing -namely, commercial revenues. Do you suggest that the services rendered should be reduced in volume or in any other way?

MR. COUSINEAU: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: So then, you are arguing

for an increase in taxes?

M. COUSINEAU: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, they would pay for the programme?

M. COUSINEAU: No. On ne touche pas à cette question de financement. Je crois bien que les postes privés qui vont servir d'intermédiaires à ce moment-là entre le commerce qui veut se servir de la radio et de la télévision au point de vue publicitaire va payer Radio-Canada pour ses programmes; mais ça n'exclut pas à ce moment-là l'aide indirecte, si vous voulez, du gouvernement, parce qu'il reste même que nous habitons un pays très vaste à population très peu dense ou à faible densité. Alors, le gouvernement, indirectement, va aider Radio-Canada en finançant Radio-Canada et peut autoriser également Radio-Canada à donner à des postes éloignés et à des postes locaux de moindre importance ou des postes régionaux, peut leur donner à eux des programmes à meilleur compte alors que les grands réseaux ou les grands postes pourraient payer un montant plus élevé, étant donné qu'ils retirent quelque chose.

Me deGRANDPRE: Ce n'est pas ce que vous dites dans votre mémoire. Dans votre mémoire, est-ce que vous ne dites pas que Radio-Canada, au lieu de faire payer les postes privés devrait les subventionner? "La production de Radio-Canada sera

mise au service des postes privés. Ce serait une manière indirecte de subventionner les postes privés qui en auront besoin".

M. COUSINEAU: Qui en auront besoin. Ca sous-entend à ce moment-là les petits postes qui sont isolés ou les postes régionaux; mais évidemment, les postes comme Montréal et Toronto qui vont recevoir de l'industrie une demande de programme publicitaire qui va être payé, ces postes-là devront payer la production peut-être au prix...

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que ce n'est pas contraire aux principes généraux de la Chambre, de subventionner des entreprises privées et de leur enlever de leur initiative personnelle pour opérer dans les cadres d'un budget bien fixe?

M. COUSINEAU: Jusqu'à un certain point, oui. On pourrait peut-être dire qu'actuellement le service des postes finance indirectement les journaux en ne leur chargeant pas le coût réel de transport pour les journaux quotidiens qui sont envoyés à l'extérieur. Si les journaux payaient exactement le coût du service des postes, je crois bien qu'il y aurait beaucoup de régions du Canada qui ne seraient pas desservies par les journaux. C'est une façon indirecte par le gouvernement de subventionner l'entreprise privée afin de donner un service à la population en général.

M. TURCOTTE: Il y a justement une question, je pense, en rapport avec le sujet que nous traitons. Malheureusement, les pages ne sont pas numérotées, je ne peux pas vous indiquer la page: "La commission devrait de plus voir à ce que les régions commercialement pauvres soient dotées de radio et de télévision, compte tenu de la langue des citoyens de ces régions". Est-ce que la commission, à ce moment-là, créerait des postes?

M. COUSINEAU: Mais elle pourrait favoriser la création des postes.

M. TURCOTTE: Comment? Si personne n'a songé à ériger un poste dans cette région, c'est parce que ce n'est pas profitable. Qui alors doit prendre l'initiative à ce moment-là d'établir un poste? Qui va le faire, si ce n'est pas profitable?

M. COUSINEAU: La Commission pourrait demander à Radio-Canada, dans ces cas spécifiques, de fournir des programmes à coût très réduit, et à ce moment-là permettrait à l'entreprise privée de s'intéresser à la question.

M. TURCOTTE: C'est encore l'idée de subvention.

M. COUSINEAU: Elle existe actuellement. Je pense bien qu'au Canada, à l'heure actuelle, il est assez difficile d'appliquer parfaitement le principe de l'entreprise privée, à cause de la manière

dont la population est dispersée. Vous avez les chemins de fer. Les chemins de fer sont subventionnés directement.

M. TURCOTTE: Pas le C.P.R.

M. COUSINEAU: Ils sont subventionnés par la permission qu'on leur accorde de charger tel montant.

M. TURCOTTE: Ce n'est pas une subvention, c'est une recommandation.

M. COUSINEAU: Elle se ferait par la commission, à ce moment-là.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have missed this because of my deficiency in understanding French, but I want to try to understand it, and the suggesting is that the CBC should be a programme agency and should sell its programmes to the private stations. Supposing it produces an important national programme - a forum discussion, let us say - on the Suez Canal crisis, which it is desirable in the interest of national understanding to have discussed; no private station wants to by it. What happens then?

M. COUSINEAU: Si, par exemple, la commission canadienne de radio et télévision classifiait ses programmes. Classe A: tout le monde est obligé de les passer; Classe B, classe C, c'est une

question de détail qui doit être discutée. Disons que cela pourrait se faire, et que ce fameux programme sur la crise de Suez est classé A et que la catégorie A doit passer sur tous les réseaux; s'il y a une réglementation tout le monde est obligé de le passer.

M. TURCOTTE: Comment savez-vous qu'il y aura un réseau?

M. COUSINEAU: Vous l'avez actuellement.

M. TURCOTTE: C'est Radio-Canada qui l'a établi. Il n'y aura pas forcément un réseau Trans-Canada et un réseau français.

M. COUSINEAU: Le réseau qui est aux mains de Radio-Canada et le réseau qui est aux mains de l'entreprise privée doit constituer un seul réseau national, et que les postes actuels ne doivent pas changer de mentalité et d'esprit, et que ce plan que Radio-Canada a, la commission canadienne de radio et de télévision devra le poursuivre. On n'est pas venu ici pour dire que Radio-Canada faisait mal. On est venu ici pour sauver le principe de l'entreprise libre.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have really just one other comment to make. In the early part - the pages are not numbered - but in the part headed "Les taux...." which is about 7 or 8 pages on, you say on the English side "we then have a double

system". Isn't that really the question, and is it quite as simple as you make it ? because we have had a great deal of evidence that we haven't got two systems, but one system. This has been the consistent judgment of Inquiry - parliamentary or otherwise - for the last 25 years. So, it is not quite as simple as you make out.

M. COUSINEAU: Nous, ce que nous avons considéré, c'est le groupe qui représente l'entreprise privée qui n'est peut-être pas coordonné, et le groupe des postes de Radio-Canada; et c'est dans ce sens-là que nous avons dit :"un système double de radiodiffusion".

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I was really only pointing out to you that you have jumped to a conclusion rather quickly on a point about which there is a great deal of debate.

MR. COUSINEAU: But never forget we are young.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a good answer and a good point at which we might adjourn. Thank you very much for coming and preparing and presenting this brief. We will consider it. We will adjourn until 2.30.

ADJOURNED TO 2:30 PM.

- - - - - - - - - - - -

UPON RESUMING AT 2:30:

THE SUBMISSION OF :

THE QUEBEC FARM FORUM ASSOCIATION

APPEARANCES:

MR. LESLIE YOUNG.

THE CHAIRMAN: Our first brief this afternoon is that of the Quebec Farm Forum Association. Mr. Leslie Young, secretary of the Association, is to present the brief, and we will begin, Mr. Young, by marking your brief as Exhibit 196. I think I should begin by saying to you how sorry we were that we didn't reach you when scheduled yesterday, and we appreciate your coming back today.

MR. YOUNG : As you were very pressed for time yesterday Mr. Fowler, would you like to forego the reading of the brief and carry straight on to the questioning ?

THE CHAIRMAN : No - we are not that pressed for time, we are sitting tomorrow morning now, for the sake of other submissions, and as far as the reading goes, it is a short brief, and you might find it as speedy to read it through, as to try to summarize it.

MR. YOUNG : Very well. Before I commence reading the brief I should mention that the name of the association has now been changed to The Quebec Farm Radio Forum -- the official name.

The Quebec Farm Radio Forum is an

Association representing the English-speaking rural and farm population in the province of Quebec. Members of the Association reside in an area which covers the Ottawa River valley, the Chateauguay Basin, the Eastern Townships and those English-speaking communities on the north and south shores of the St. Lawrence River. In addition, services are extended to the people living in the Gaspe Peninsula.

The Quebec Farm Radio Forum, as the name implies, is an association of Farm Forums, or listening groups of neighbours representing from four to twenty five families each. The Quebed Farm Radio Forum is democratically controlled by the member Farm Forums.

The primary objective of the Quebec Farm Radio Forum is to improve the standard of living and way of life for rural families. Now in order to do this it must strive to improve both the social and economic conditions in the rural communities.

One of the ways the Quebec Farm Radio Forum attempts to achieve these goals is through affiliation with similar bodies in the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. It is also very actively engaged in promoting the policy and program of National Farm Radio Forum. In addition it serves the rural population in many other capacities and encourages the study and discussion of questions of local interest.

As the services rendered by the present sound and television broadcasting system are of tremendous importance to the Farm Forgum program and to other

aspects of the Association's program, and because changes of policy might adversely affect these services the Quebec Farm Radio Forum Association submits the following suggestions and recommendations concerning future policy of sound and television broadcasting in Canada.

1. Controlling Agency.

Sound and television broadcasting are mediums of mass communication and have had, and will continue to have, a tremendous effect on the life and culture of the Canadian people. In view of the limited number of wavelengths and broadcasting outlets available, the persons or agencies to which these are assigned have a monopoly or partial monopoly on broadcasting. Therefore the Quebec Farm Radio Forum is of the opinion that to provide the maximum security for the interests of the Canadian people, licensing of sound and television broadcasting stations be subject to control by an agency of the government, and that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation be that agency.

2. NETWORKS. (a) The Quebec Farm Radio Forum Association supports the principle that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation should continue to develop a national system for both sound and television broadcasting as a public service to the people of Canada. Radio in Canada has developed along these lines since 1932 and lately efforts have been made to duplicate the service with television. The QFFA believes that the CBC has done a magnificent job is discharging these responsibilities. Under Canadian conditions it

does not seem possible that any other regulatory body is either necessary or practicable. A separate body would either give rise to a duplication of services, or would allow two independent groups of radio and television broadcasting stations, one public and one private. Impartial treatment of these groups would mean that the CBC would not be able to control the channels necessary to ensure national coverage which is considered adequate for existing conditions. This would mean the loss of the present national broadcasting system.

(b) A unique situation in Canadian broadcasting has been the development of a group of privately owned radio broadcasting stations within the national system. These stations, because of Canadian conditions, are ideally suited for providing local community service as well as increasing national coverage. While increased costs may prohibit such rapid and extensive development in the television field, the Quebec Farm Radio Forum feels that although the CBC should control the licensing of private stations, it should encourage and foster the development of television along a similar pattern.

3. Programmes and Services

(a) A fair proportion of Canadian-produced programmes must also be available for national distribution if Canada is to successfully resist absorption into the cultural pattern of the United States. Programmes of a good

quality are much more expensive per capita, to produce in Canada than in the United States. However, the QFRF feels that the CBC has, to date, been quite successful in producing a wide variety of good quality programmes of interest to both the majority and minority elements of the Canadian public. Continuation of such policy which makes maximum use of Canadian talent is recommended.

(b) It is recognized that not all programmes can be Canadian produced nor should this be the case. A fair proportion of the better quality programmes which are available should be imported from other countries. Such a policy will improve understanding and broaden the thinking of Canadians. It is necessary, though, for the present at least, that the CBC retain some measure of control over the importation of programmes both for the private stations as well as the national system.

(c) As a public service, radio and lately television, have been providing coast to coast broadcasting of weather reports, news bulletins, and coverage of national events. Of particular interest to the Quebec Farm Forum Association are the market reports, the Farm Forum broadcasts and the other types of information services which the CBC has made available to rural people. Of all measures for the improvement of the standard of living for rural people through study and discussion, the Farm Forum broadcasts have been of

greatest benefit and the Quebec Farm Radio Forum is extremely grateful to the CBC for this service. The very type of the Farm Forum programme requires that it cannot be sponsored and that it must be available at the good listening hours of 8.30 to 9.00 p.m. Without a national system this service could not be given to Canadians. This programme and others of a similar type do much to make Canada truly Canadian and to improve and ensure a better way of life for Canadians. In our opinion such programmes should be continued as a public service to Canadians regardless of cost.

4. Financing

(a) An agency supplying the services which the CBC gives the Canadian public cannot be expected to be self-sustaining. At present the major items of income for the CBC are excise taxes, advertising revenue and government grants. Adequate finances are a necessity and it is recommended that some method of financing be found that would guarantee sufficient funds for the CBC at least five years in advance. If long term finances are not assured, the possibility of too much commercialism and frequent spot announcements will be increased to provide more revenue. Another hazard which short finances encourage is the replacing of service or good quality programmes during the better listening hours by programmes of inferior quality which produce more revenue.

(b) In providing for the funds which

are set aside for the CBC, care should be exercised that no other agency be allowed to interfere in their expenditure. If other controls are placed on the funds, the CBC's plans and programmes may be adversely affected.

(c) Advertising revenue from Canadian television programmes is usually insufficient to cover the cost of production of the programme and to provide funds for extending the national system for more complete coverage. Because good Canadian programmes not only provide a service to Canadians, but also contribute highly to our cultural development and provide a medium for the expression and development of Canadian talent, it is highly desirable that the CBC be given sufficient funds to fulfill such an ambitious programme. Such funds could be made available by government grants based on a definite predetermined sum per capita.

(d) It is not to be expected that private stations will be able to produce all or many of their own programmes. Therefore to encourage the establishment of private stations, the CBC could provide programmes, both Canadian and imported, for a fee which would make it possible to operate private stations in certain centres.

The Quebec Farm Radio Forum is very grateful for this opportunity to present its views to the Royal Commission on Broadcasting.

We hope and trust that our viewpoints will be given sympathetic consideration in the findings and report of the Commission so that the report may be a valuable guide for the establishing and formation of policy for the development of the sound and television broadcasting in Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Young. Mr. Coyne, do you have any questions?

MR. COYNE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Young, you say that the Quebec Farm Forum is an association of farm forums or listening groups of neighbours representing from four to twenty-five families each -- I am looking at the second paragraph on the first page.

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Could you give us any idea of how many groups there are in your Association?

MR. YOUNG: It varies from year to year -- in a peak year we have one hundred and thirty-eight -- I believe now there are about ninety.

MR. COYNE: I see. Are they pretty well spread throughout the province, or rather the English-speaking section?

MR. YOUNG: It is entirely English-speaking and the larger proportion are in the Ottawa Quebec valley and Pontiac and the Eastern Townships. We have some listeners in the Gaspe, too, but we had difficulty in maintaining the group there because it is so far away.

MR. COYNE: Is the National Radio Forum programme broadcast in the Gaspe -- is there some English-language service there?

MR. YOUNG: It is through the Maritime stations.

MR. COYNE: Oh, yes.

MR. YOUNG: In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. We actually we have only two stations broadcasting in Quebec, one in Quebec City and one in Montreal -- the CBC in Montreal. The Ottawa broadcasts are received from Ottawa -- or the Ottawa Valley broadcasts are received through Ontario and the last part of the programmes is the Ontario Regional views, not Quebec.

MR. COYNE: There are only two stations in Quebec which carry this programme -- in Quebec?

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

MR. COYNE: None of the private stations do that?

MR. YOUNG: Not at present.

MR. COYNE: Are there any English-speaking private stations in Quebec outside of the cities of Montreal and Quebec?

MR. YOUNG: Well, I am not too familiar with that, but there is one in Sherbrooke at least, CKTS. I have never made any inquiries into the matter, but I don't think there are any more in the Ottawa River Valley district.

MR. COYNE: What is the National Farm Radio Forum -- could you just describe to us

briefly what it is?

MR. YOUNG: Well, it is a study discussion programme which originated about sixteen years ago, at the beginning of the Second World War, and the basis of it is a radio broadcast which is put on by the CBC on Monday evenings from the end of October through to the end of March and there are four broadcasts a month. There is usually a break at Christmas time or around that period, and it goes on at eight-thirty, running to nine o'clock, on Trans-Canada network, I think it is held up an hour for the West.

MR. COYNE: Is there any national Association of which your Association is a part?

MR. YOUNG: Yes, each province has its own Farm Forum body, and they are joined together in the National Farm Radio Forum, with offices in Toronto.

MR. COYNE: How does the Farm Radio Forum support itself -- that is your organization -- are there any membership dues?

MR. YOUNG: Oh, yes, each family has to pay certain membership dues and we have received some grants from the Government.

THE CHAIRMAN: Which Government?

MR. YOUNG: Well, ours is the Provincial. Each province receives a grant. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture and the Co-op Union of Canada, sometimes the National Dairy Council, chip in to support the National body,

besides what the provinces are able to pay.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Young, on the next page you are dealing with, firstly, a controlling agency, and you say it is the opinion of your Association that the licensing of sound and television broadcast stations be subject to control by an agency of the Government and that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation be that agency. I don't think that anyone has seriously suggested before the Commission that sound and television broadcasting stations should not be licensed -- that is what seems to be a point of view which is universally accepted by virtually everybody.

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Are you suggesting that this controlling agency would have control over broadcasting stations in that limited sense?

MR. YOUNG: You mean in the sense that it is limited to the fact that it gives or refuses to give them a licence -- is that it?

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. YOUNG: Oh, no, no, I don't mean in that strictly limited sense at all.

MR. COYNE: In other words, your Association contemplates and advocates that this agency, for example, should be one of regulation?

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

MR. COYNE: In addition to licensing?

MR. YOUNG: Yes. I am sorry if that is not clear.

MR. COYNE: Well, is it a small point -- or at least I just wanted to make sure that we were clear on what you meant.

MR. YOUNG: Well, while we are on this point, I would like to add that the national system, as I interpret it, and as it was interpreted by the people who made this brief, not only includes the CBC but

MR. YOUNG: While we are on this point, I would like to add that the national system, as I interpret it, and as it was interpreted by the people who made this brief, not only includes the CBC but also the local service provided by private stations. We cannot see how, if you have a separate regulatory body, you will not put the private stations immediately into direct competition with the CBC and therefore break the local contact with the national service. Instead of having more or less an affiliation, as it now stands, and which seems to be working quite all right, as soon as you have a regulatory body you will be having them in open competition. You may have competition now, but the point is, the minute you say"regulatory body" then you have open competition.

MR. COYNE: I suppose even today the private stations really fall into two types, in this sense, that certain of them are affiliated with one or other of the CBC networks, and then in addition there is a very large number of them that are unaffiliated in any network sense. Assuming some arrangements were made, without specifying them, perhaps, to ensure that the present networks continued to operate as networks, what is the objection to permitting unaffiliated stations, if they so desire, going their own way, so to speak, and, if it is economically feasible, forming their own networks? They would not be interfering with the national service as it

exists at the moment, because I am assuming that would continue.

MR. YOUNG: If it is economically feasible, I cannot see too much objection, but I doubt if it is economically feasible in very many instances.

MR. COYNE: You may doubt it and I may doubt it, but if the people concerned are prepared to risk it, isn't it their concern? It would be their money at stake.

THE CHAIRMAN: It might or might not, Mr. Coyne.

MR. COYNE: That is quite true, Mr. Chairman, but making the assumptions which I think have been inherent in this discussion, we were assuming the situation where the national network was preserved in its present scope, and concerning ourselves with the question as to whether or not those stations not taking part in the national service -- that is, within the networks -- wish to form a network of their own.

MR. YOUNG: I see your point, but I was trying to make the point that all stations are taking part in the national network, whether they so state or not, because of the fact they provide a local service. They cannot help but form part of a national network to give better coverage.

MR. COYNE: If I may just be sure as to your meaning, they are not really part of the national network, but you view them as part of the national service?

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Just taking that for a moment, does it necessarily follow that if you had a separate body controlling the stations that they could not, under the jurisdiction of the separate body, continue to fulfill some proper part in the public service?

MR. YOUNG: They might continue to fulfill some proper part, but I think the mere fact that you have a separate regulatory body indicates that somewhere along the line there is competition or else there would not be any necessity for a separate regulatory body, and as soon as you have competition I think you will find there will be a break in the services which they give.

MR. COYNE: You are really saying, in effect, that you are afraid of what might happen; isn't that what it boils down to?

MR. YOUNG: Afraid in what way?

MR. COYNE: Afraid that the national service may be interfered with or upset or weakened if this separate body was ---

MR. YOUNG: Yes, I do think it could be upset or weakened. I definitely think it would be weakened at least for a while. There may come a time when a separate regulatory body is necessary, but at the present time I don't think it is economically feasible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there anything in your thought, Mr. Young, that the function that these private stations are performing might also be altered, if not weakened, if they moved into

duplication of the network system? Is this in your thought or not? I am not saying it is so.

MR. YOUNG: It is in my thought because, as I see it, you have the private broadcasters now joined together in their own association, and you have the CBC, the private broadcasters for the most part providing a local service, and the CBC national coverage, but as soon as you have a separate regulatory body, then the private broadcasters will most likely band together to form their own networks, if they are allowed to, which will give them a national aspect, the CBC a national aspect, and tend to detract from the local interests which the private stations are now serving.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are not too sure of that, Mr. Young. We have had various requests for the right to form networks if they want to, but as far as I can recall we still have to have anybody say they really want to form a network or would, in fact, form one -- that is, a real national network. This is something on which we will have to get some more information later.

MR. YOUNG: I am not sure whether you have had requests or not. I wasn't trying to say there would be requests or not, but if there are no requests for it, why have a regulatory body in the first place?

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I am talking about the network side of your suggestion.

MR. COYNE: In connection with your previous answer to the Chairman, do I understand you

as saying that if the private stations were permitted to form national networks -- private networks -- then their energies and interests to some extent would be diverted into the realm of national programming, and your fear in those circumstances is that their present local function may be correspondingly neglected?

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

MR. COYNE: That is a summary of the position you are taking?

MR. YOUNG: Yes, that is a fair summary of it.

MR. COYNE: Just turning the page, you have been referring to the private stations providing local service, and yougo on:

> "While increased costs may prohibit such rapid and extensive development in the television field, the Quebec Farm Radio Forum feels that although the CBC should control the licensing of private stations, it should encourage and foster the development of television along a similar pattern."

Do I take it from that that your Association is against the present single-channel policy in television?

MR. YOUNG: No, no. We are not against the present single channel. I think we would be against it if it were found that other private stations could be operated economically within the same area and if there were enough channels for them.

MR. COYNE: The issue as put to us is that there are people ready, willing and able in some of the larger centres, anyway, to operate private stations on a commercial basis.

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And the only reason they cannot do so is because there is a policy which says there shall not be a licence granted except to a single station.

MR. YOUNG: Well, if they have resources to provide good programmes, and if it is economically feasible, and if there are enough channels, I don't see why they should not be allowed to have a private station.

MR. COYNE: What you are saying, in effect, is that assuming on an economic basis they can establish a local service providing some acceptable standard of programming, then you think the single-channel policy should be abandoned; is that fair?

MR. YOUNG: Yes, that is fair, but I am not disagreeing with the present policy.

MR. COYNE: Is it just a matter of timing, do you think?

MR. YOUNG: Well, I think in time possibly, but I would hesitate to say how long.

MR. COYNE: Well, surely on the basis of your earlier answer it only goes on until someone comes up with a specific proposition to set up a station meeting these standards that you spoke of?

MR. YOUNG: Yes, if they can meet those standards, but the big question is whether they can

do it or not.

MR. COYNE: But that is not the question of the single-channel policy. That is another question.

MR. YOUNG: Oh, no, as far as I am concerned, and as far as the people who helped me with this brief are concerned, we would be quite willing to see a private station provided it could be operated in a manner which would produce good programmes and still would not break the national television coverage.

MR. COYNE: On the following page where you are speaking of programmes and services, and specifically of the Farm Forum type of programme, yousay in about the middle of the paragraph:

> "The very type of the Farm Forum programme requires that it cannot be sponsored . . ."

I wonder if you could explain a little more fully why you think it cannot be sponsored. Is this an objection in principle, or are you expressing an opinion that you don't think anybody would sponsor it?

MR. YOUNG: Oh, no, it could be sponsored, I believe, but any question which is discussed, we try to present both sides evenly and fairly -- look at both sides of the question -- and as soon as someone comes along to sponsor it, then they immediately try to colour the broadcast one way or the other.

MR. COYNE: We are interested in that sort

of proposition, but we have had a great deal of evidence that in practice that is not so, specifically in connection with news broadcasts which are perhaps the most vulnerable to that sort of influence -- most news broadcasts in this country are sponsored.

MR. YOUNG: It may not be so from the point of view -- let me put it this way; it may not be practice, but surely, for instance, if there was a broadcast on Co-operatives, or something like that; well, say the meat packers, or some other private corporation or private company would claim, if Co-operatives were sponsoring a Co-operative broadcast ---

MR. COYNE: Aren't maybe you speculating a little there?

MR. YOUNG: Oh, no.

MR. COYNE: That may not have been fair, but let me put it this way: if the CBC is producing a series of programmes called Farm Forum which they in their entire discretion plan and produce, and govern the contents; having done that, or having planned to do so, the programme content being fixed, is there still nonetheless an objection in your mind if they go to some commercial concern or some commercial concern comes to them and says, "We would be prepared to sponsor that programme if you give us a spot at the beginning or a spot at the end", or whatever advertising arrangements are made in connection with sponsorship. Is there still an objection in principle or in practice,

given those assumptions -- it is the CBC programme?

MR. YOUNG: Well, I am really not sure. The thing that has almost happened, and what bothers us somewhat is that the broadcasts are prepared live -- like a discussion among four people or so with a chairman, and we try to have people representing both sides. If somebody is left out there are complaints, not only from the listeners but from the parties who have been omitted.

MR. COYNE: It may be that there would not be a sponsor, that no-one knowing the nature of the programme and these things you mention, that no-one would come forward or be prepared to sponsor it, but assuming there was somebody, is there any objection in principle to the sponsorship, which would have perhaps this advantage of providing some additional funds to CBC which could then be devoted to improving the quality of programmes or increasing the number of hours of service to the farm population, or what have you?

MR. YOUNG: I will give you a qualified answer: there is no objection so long as things remain as they are.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Mr. Young, I wonder if you are thinking of, as possible sponsors, companies who deal peculiarly in farm produce? You mentioned packing houses, or food and fertilizer people, or something like that. I would rather judge from your first reply that that is sort of in your mind, whereas your farm population are purchasers of suits and boots and shoes and all

kinds of clothing; they are not peculiar to the farm population. Would you have the same objection to a sponsor of that kind who is, say, advertising suits or boots, as against the fertilizer fellow?

MR. YOUNG: One of the main objections to it is that any advertising breaks the continuity of the programme, and we try to have a programme in which there is no break during the half hour, and as soon as you start having sponsors, then the continuity is broken.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: And you reduce the length of the programme?

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That would be your main objection?

MR. YOUNG: That is one of our big objections.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have had put to us also, Mr. Young -- I forget where this was, but it was somewhere in our travels -- that it wasn't only a question of actual interference with programme content, but it was the feeling or fear that the public would think that there had been interference. I am not trying to put arguments in your mouth or even support or knock down your arguments, but this is a point that has been raised with us, if you think there is anything in it.

MR. YOUNG: There is definitely a lot in it. We ran into that trouble here in Quebec: we were at one time considering receiving grants from companies to help us out with our financing of

our Association, and as soon as we took one grant of $100 everyone said we were being influenced by such-and-such a company.

MR. COYNE: Well, "everybody said", but was there, in fact, any influence?

MR. YOUNG: No, there wasn't.

MR. COYNE: Surely, then, the only reason for that was because of the ignorance of the people making the statements.

MR. YOUNG: I am not so sure. There wasn't time to be any influence.

MR. COYNE: Just one other question: On the final page, Mr. Young, in the final paragraph immediately above the line:

> "Therefore to encourage the establishment of private stations, the CBC could provide programmes, both Canadian and imported, for a fee which would make it possible to operate private stations in certain centres."

Could you indicate what you mean there? Do you mean the private stations would pay for these programmes by fee?

-

-

-

Could you indicate what you mean there; do you mean that the private stations would pay for these programmes a fee, or what?

MR. YOUNG: But I don't mean specifically a fee -- in the same way as they are now paying for programme material from the CBC.

MR. COYNE: I don't think they pay anything to the CBC.

MR. YOUNG: Don't they? Well, I am sorry; I wasn't aware of that at the time.

MR. COYNE: What really perhaps confused me a little, and you might be able to clarify this for me, you say a fee which would make it possible to operate private stations from certain centres, and I took it from the final words that you were thinking of making it possible to operate private stations in centres where it was not otherwise possible -- presumably for economic reasons. I found that a little inconsistent. I would have thought by charging such fees to stations or to make it possible to operate such stations, that it would have had precisely the opposite effect.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps he means that the fee should not be so large as to make it impossible to operate the private stations.

MR. COYNE: That may be, yes.

MR. YOUNG: I think that they should get assistance in every way that is practicable.

MR. COYNE: That is the primary point of this paragraph?

MR. YOUNG: Yes.

MR. COYNE: When there is a legitimate

reason for assisting the operations of private stations?

MR. YOUNG: If it is possible, yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, Mr. Young, in paragraph (b) on the last page of your submission you say, with respect to private funds set aside for the CBC, that care should be exercised that no other agency be allowed to interfere in their expenditure; what particularly do you mean by that?

MR. YOUNG: The separate regulatory body.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Oh, I see.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Young; we will consider your brief.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you very much, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is that of Station CJAD in Montreal, and Mr. Dupont, Mr. McCurdy and Mr. Conlon are here to present it.

## SUBMISSION OF STATION CJAD - MONTREAL

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dupont, which particular document you wish to file. I was just handed now a supplementary brief which I take it is a revision of the document which came to us in a blue cover to start with; is that correct?

MR. DUPONT: Mr. Chairman, that is correct, and with your permission I would like to substitute a copy with very slight corrections to the one which was sent to the Ottawa office.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well, then, so we will mark the revised one in place of the original one, which we will mark out.

MR. COYNE: I think in point of fact you are speaking of a supplementary brief?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is right.

MR. COYNE: There are two documents?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, so that first of all we have a brief which is made up in a dark blue cover which will be marked as Exhibit 197, and I think we had better, since they are separate,mark the supplementary brief as No. 198. We will mark only the slightly revised copy.

EXHIBIT NO. 197 -- Brief of Station CJAD, Montreal.

EXHIBIT NO. 198 -- Supplementary Brief of Station CJAD, Montreal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dupont, I think you know our procedure -- you have been here for a day or so and have seen it. We would like you to present your brief, and you may take it that we have seen it and you do not read lists or anything of that sort. Perhaps you could just touch the highlights of it and then we will proceed to the questioning.

MR. DUPONT: Yes, sir, thank you. To begin with I would like to say a very few words about the corporate organization of CJAD, which is a family holding to the extent of 95 per cent. This is a fact which has some influence on the operation of the station.

I would like also to cover very briefly by just a few words my experience, my career, which brought me to the time when there was a need for an alternate private station in Montreal. When I left school I served four years with the Canadian Bank of Commerce in various branches in the Province of Quebec.

THE CHAIRMAN: We won't hold that against you.

MR. DUPONT: Thank you, sir. Next I was four years with the C.P.R. in the Public Relations Department of the Steamship Division, and in 1924 I joined the services of the radio station CKAC, which, as you know, was the pioneer station in Montreal, starting in 1922 or 1923. I served that station in the capacity of an announcer, and in 1927 as manager. In 1934 the Government of the day decided to go ahead with the organization of the state-owned radio service, and my services were requested from my then present employer, and I went to CRBC, where I served to the year 1945. During that stage there were two periods, the first under the aegis of the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission, and up to 1936-37, and the second one in the years 1937 until 1945. In these two organizations, the first one I served in the capacity of programme director for Eastern Canada, having the responsibility of programme organization for the Province of Quebec and Montreal, and exchange programmes with the United States. In 1937, when the CBC came

into being, evidently there were thoughts on the part of people who were then looking after the new set-up as a need for additional funds, which was becoming very apparent, and probably, by reason of my past experience in the private field, I was asked to transfer to the commercial division of the CBC for the Province of Quebec, which position I held until the time I made my severance in June 1945, when I left to start CJAD, which began its operation on the 8th of December, 1945.

THE CHAIRMAN: Were you the manager of the commercial division for Quebec?

MR. DUPONT: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: You were manager; I don't know that you actually made that clear.

MR. DUPONT: Yes, I was manager of the commercial division for the Province of Quebec and director of programmes for the CBC from 1932 to 1936 or 1937.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I got that part, but I didn't know whether you were manager; I knew you were on the commercial side.

MR. DUPONT: I feel that it is quite important that I should acquaint the Commission with the accomplishments of CJAD, because an organization which starts from scratch, so to speak, in a city the size of Montreal, with its complex requirements, deserves an explanation, which I would like to submit.

We commenced operation on the 8th of December, 1945, to serve the English-speaking population of Greater Montreal, the Eastern

Townships, the Laurentians, and the Lower Ottawa Valley. As I state, at this time Montreal was served by only one private English-language station, and there was a need for an alternate deal.

We started with a one kilowatt transmitter, which was subsequently increased in 1945 to five kilowatts, and today we are operating on the basis of a ten kilowatt station. We brought up our broadcasting equipment to the point that it is rated today as one in the best in Canada amongst the electronic consultants. We have installed high fidelity service and a ten kilowatt transmitter and we are still the only station in Canada to have taken this step forward. Our broadcasting station at Mackayville outside Montreal maintains complete up-to-date transmitters, both of them equipped with their own auxiliary power to serve its audience without interruption.

Within a year of its founding CJAD began to enjoy the highest daytime and night-time rating amongst English radio stations in the area it served. This position has never been surrendered.

All this has been accomplished in ten years in direct competition with other English-language stations of Montreal, including the Government-owned subsidized outlets, which were in the field for many years before CJAD came into existence. It was accomplished despite the fact that its subsidized opposition was also its master through the broadcasting regulations at present prevailing in Canada. It was accomplished with

private capital, risked under a free enterprise system. The people of Canada, through Government radio, took none of the risks, paid none of the costs. On the contrary, CJAD has put considerable money into the public coffers through taxation over the last ten years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dupont, might I ask you one question: I don't want to go into any personal matters or any matters of your private affairs, but can you give me an idea of what order of magnitude of capital investment is involved in an operation such as yours; it doesn't have to be exact -- I want an idea, that is all.

MR. DUPONT: I would say today we are spending one-half million.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it in the order of a half-million dollar investment?

MR. DUPONT: Oh, I do not think you could duplicate our present set-up with that amount of money today.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, because of course costs have gone up in this as in every other field.

MR. DUPONT: Costs have gone up, real estate has gone up, especially in Montreal, where you have to locate your transmitter.

THE CHAIRMAN: But your actual investment over this fairly recent period is of the order of four to five hundred thousand dollars; is that correct?

MR. DUPONT: It is in that vicinity.

Possibly to give you an illustration of the cost, three months ago we purchased a mobile unit, a mobile studio and we believe it is about as complete as can be found. This unit is not quite finished, we still have one component to add to it which we will do and the cost will be $20,000. The staff to man this mobile unit will cost between $20,000 and $25,000 per year.

Radio station CJAD is pleased to have this opportunity to tell the Commission something about the operations of one of many privately owned radio stations in Canada.

CJAD subscribes to all the recommendations of the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters. We felt, however, that it might be helpful to the Commission to have the thoughts of an individual station in addition to the recommendations of all stations combined.

Radio station CJAD is ten years old. However, the radio experience of its managing director, J. Arthur Dupont, goes back over 32 years. Furthermore, many of Mr. Dupont's associates have been with CJAD since it began and had widespread radio experience before that time. Mr. Dupont himself was with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and its predecessor, The Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission, for twelve years prior to the opening of CJAD.

The thoughts expressed in this submission, therefore, are those of people thoroughly familiar with radio in Canada -- and furthermore, familiar

with the operation of government radio as well as private stations.

Radio station CJAD commenced operations on the 8th of December, 1945, to serve the English speaking population of greater Montreal, the Eastern Townships, the Laurentians and the Lower Ottawa Valley.

The station started with a one kilowatt transmitter. It has subsequently increased its power to five kilowatts and then to ten kilowatts.

It has built up its broadcasting techniques to the point that it is rated today among the best in Canada by Electronic Consultants.

It has installed high fidelity service on its ten kilowatt transmitter -- the only station in Canada yet to take this forward step on ten kilowatt power.

At its broadcasting tower at Mackayville, outside Montreal, it maintains two complete up-to-date transmitters, each equipped with its own auxiliary power to serve its audience without interruption.

Within a year of its founding, CJAD began to enjoy the highest daytime and night-time rating among English radio stations in the area it serves. This position it has never surrendered.

All this has been accomplished in ten years in direct competition with other English language stations of Montreal, including the government owned subsidized outlet, which were in the field for many years before CJAD came into existence. It was accomplished despite the fact that its subsidized opposition was also its master through the broadcasting regulations at present prevailing in Canada. It was accomplished with private capital, risked under a free enterprise system. The people of Canada, through government radio, took none of the risks, paid none of the costs. On the contrary, CJAD has put considerable money into the public coffers through taxation over the last ten years.

Radio station CJAD has reached its present position in the English speaking areas of greater Montreal because it has consistently dedicated itself to the concept that a radio station must perform a needed public service in the community in which it operates. Therefore --

> CJAD instituted news on the hour, every hour of the broadcasting day. In case of emergency such as war being declared, almost everyone (95 per cent) would turn to radio for information and more than half (55 per cent) would tune in CJAD.
>
> CJAD initiated weather reports direct from the Public Weather Office at Dorval ...

Anyone living in Montreal will no doubt appreciate this particular service. We were the first ones to pioneer in that service and it is not until this year that we have had to share it, not on our own decision but pressure was brought that it should be given to another station.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suppose the pressure was based on the fact that you were going to a public service for the information and, therefore, if it goes to one I suppose the argument was it should go to the others.

MR. DUPONT: I suppose there is merit in that but we had the idea and maintained the service without commercial sponsorship. I do not argue whether it was right or wrong.

CJAD initiated, for the growing motoring public, complete daily road reports from the Royal Automobile Club.

CJAD pioneered regular direct ski reports from the Laurentians -- providing an important service to skiers and helping to build the reputation of the Laurentians as a winter playground.

CJAD established an actuality department to cover all important local events as an integral part of its news service to the community.

On this subject may I interject that with our mobile unit which we only had on the 23rd of

June this summer we covered the activities of 13 or 14 affairs in the eastern townships bringing to the attention of our listeners in and around Montreal the various facets of country life.

CJAD has in the past given free radio time to all political parties both in the Federal and Provincial governments.

We do not give it any more, we did it for years as a matter of policy because we felt the men were so great that we had to sort of lower the bars and apply some restriction in the division of time.

CJAD instituted a system of providing free radio time to the three major religious groups of the community -- Roman Catholic, Protestant and Jewish. No other station in Montreal provides this service.

CJAD gained CBS affiliation, to bring to Montreal listening audiences such cultural gems as the New York Philharmonic.

CJAD inaugurated and still maintains regular free time allotments to community affairs -- notably the Police Juvenile Club, Boy Scouts, Junior Chamber of Commerce, etc.

CJAD has given encouragement to local producers and writers by broadcasting a series of local half-hour plays.

CJAD has encouraged young local talent through programmes such as the "Little Players of the Air".

This has been on the station for six or seven years and to each organization every year we award two scholarships of $50 each.

CJAD distributed a portrait in colour of the Royal Family in conjunction with the activities surrounding the Coronation Year. Over 75,000 pictures were distributed to the Catholic and Protestant school children of greater Montreal.

The services listed previously are only part of CJAD's contribution to the welfare of the community in which it operates. As a privately owned radio station, it must conform as well with the general responsibilities of any privately owned company.

The Canadian Chamber of Commerce defines the eight major responsibilities of a company to the community in which it is located.

1. To Earn A Profit: Unless it does, its existence as a business will be short lived.

CJAD has earned sufficient to keep increasing and improving its service.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has done more than that, it has made a good profit.

MR. DUPONT: You have our statement.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not going to go into it.

MR. DUPONT: I would like to answer your question because our books are open. We have never

dispersed since 1950 or 1951 more than 6 per cent of the investment capital to our shareholders, everything else has gone into the business and reserves for future expansion. As I told you, in 1945 we started on a one kilowatt, in 1948 we had 5 kilowatts and 1951 with 10 kilowatts which cost us considerable money. In 1955 we stripped our entire studio facilities and put in high fidelity which is exclusive except for the National Film Board. In 1956 we put on this mobile unit and in 1957 we will not end the year without having our own building for which plans are now being blueprinted and which will be, I think, a most functional business. I think that is a very good record for a free capital organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: The only point of my question was merely to put the general point that this operation which you have described as a free enterprise, private enterprise venture, has been, in terms of such an enterprise, a success.

MR. DUPONT: I would say it has been a whopping success.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am trying to blow your horn harder than you are.

MR. DUPONT: Well I do not know if sometimes it is too good to blow it. Mind you, I am not too modest.

The growth of CJAD has been steady and because of this expansion more jobs are to be had at the station than ever

before. Over the past 10 years, the staff of CJAD has more than tripled. The employees of the station are among highest paid in the industry.

We have, I believe, 52 employees not including our sales organization and while we were mentioning capital investment I think it is well to appreciate that my family and myself, we have put between $8,000 and $10,000 in capital investment for every employee.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Are you confronted with labour unions in that?

MR. DUPONT: Sir, I have no labour union, I have no trouble with labour. Last June there was a statement made by a gentleman in Ontario just before the opening of the session that the radio station employees were the worst paid. I am paying and I am proud and I am going to pay more, the highest salary in that industry. I have the best people, I want the best people and they are worth it and it is not because I am a managing programme director. It is a fact we have a pension fund we started three years ago after we got into business which is really generous, we contribute up to 57 per cent of contribution. I have nothing to do with it, they pay this on their own choice, their own condition. We have accident, we have sickness; a fellow gets married he gets a bonus; if his wife presents him with a child he gets a bonus. Twice a year in June

for the last nine years we have given one week's salary as bonus and in December two weeks bonus. This is what private enterprise can do and when I was with the Bank of Commerce we used to get bonuses just like that. Is that not a fact, Mr. Stewart?

3. To Promote and Maintain Good Employee Relations:

CJAD has amply met its responsibilities in this connection. Out of the original 18 employees, ten are still working at the station. One of the main reasons for this attitude is the family spirit that prevails throughout CJAD. Since 1946 its employees have enjoyed a more than generous life, accident, sickness and pension plan.

4. To Foster An Awareness and Appreciation of Local Industry:

A better understanding creates and maintains a climate favourable to industry and this has been the policy of the station ever since its inception. CJAD does this successfully through its programming and public service events.

5. To Be A Real Part of the Community - not only in its industrial life but in all endeavours for civic and cultural betterment.

CJAD is actively interested in the community. Not only does it help out by encouraging endeavours for civic and cultural betterment, but it also gives free time to many charitable campaigns. For example, in 1955 alone the station contributed over $100,000 of radio time to campaigns such as the Catholic Charities, the Welfare Federation and the Combined Jewish Appeal.

This is a comprehensive programme of Public Service which CJAD strongly adheres to whether it be helping a family obtain food and clothing or aiding a fund-raising campaign for the Montreal General Hospital. No cause is too great and none too small.

Again on this point I would like to interject this; last April the Province of Quebec Society for Crippled Children found themselves in a very difficult plight, its fleet of ambulances could not stand any more, they had been used for about eight or ten years and the cost of replacement or repair would have been more than the cost of purchasing the ambulances. It so happens that this is one of the organizations on which I serve voluntarily and at a meeting of the board the situation was brought to us for administration. What could we do? Our tag day only came in the Fall, September 20, and

last year unfortunately we were rained out and we came quite short of our objective. I volunteered to sell CJAD for $1, the operation of the station for one day. We signed a notarized legal document whereby the Quebec Society for Crippled Children took CJAD lock, stock and parcel, provided us with staff in return for which we turned over to them the entire commercial revenue of our day's operation. The net result was this, we got sufficient money to buy one ambulance and one station wagon. The general public responded most generously. Three clubs, the Lions Club, the Kiwanis and the Rotary each gave an ambulance and we were given two jeeps. This was one move in the right direction at an opportune time and we were able to, through our action, renew the entire fleet of this most deserving organization. Paragraph 6 you will allow me to pass.

7. To Take An Active Interest In Education:

Industry's stake in the education of the youth of the community is paramount.

Over a period of years CJAD has maintained close relations with educational groups as well as the Montreal Chamber of Commerce and the Board of Trade. One of its projects last year was to conduct a radio course for the Young Men's section of the Montreal Board of Trade. A good number of men attended the course which gave them a general insight

into the trials and tribulations of radio announcing, programming, production and engineering. This course was given free of charge.

8. To Sell The Merits Of Our Competitive Enterprise System:

CJAD is continuously selling the free enterprise system by way of example, for it has been developed entirely by Canadian talent and labour; it is a single proprietor type of operation, owner managed.

Against the background outlined on previous pages, CJAD, an owner-managed private radio station, recommends:-

1. That an independent regulatory body be set up to govern radio and television broadcasting in Canada. We submit that the present system is as unfair to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as it is to the private stations. No human being, nor body of human beings, should be placed in the position of being both regulator and competitor, both judge and plaintiff, both governing and governed. The present powers of the CBC to regulate its competitors have no parallel in any other regulatory body in Canada; have no parallel in the regulation of broadcasting anywhere else in the world; and are not consistent with the principles of democracy in Canada.

2. That private stations be allowed to make network affiliations with other Canadian stations on a permanent basis if they so desire, so that they can reduce production costs and increase employment among Canadian artists, since no station working by itself today is able to assume the cost of large shows for limited distribution.

3. That radio stations in major cities across Canada which have affiliation with American networks be allowed to continue such affiliation, since it enables them to bring to their listeners some of the finest musical programmes, the best in dramatic production, actuality reports of world events, and other features of considerable importance to the listening public.

4. That major Canadian cities which are now denied private television licenses be opened up to allow viewers an alternate choice in programmes; and that stations having affiliation with American networks be given the same privilege of tying up with their television counterpart in the United States, to bring to their people some of the better programmes which cannot be produced locally. As an example, Canadians could never absorb the cost of carrying shows such as the Sadler's Wells Ballet -- their fee alone being $90,000.

It is a well known fact that the world's greatest drama and music fall under the voice of an international tongue. Hence, it is impossible to say that any one station is going to Americanize Canadian television. Therefore, why should the people of Canada be denied these cultural benefits because we cannot warrant the expenditure?

5. That, in the light of its radio accomplishments, CJAD, a community public service station, as well as a successful business operation, be granted a private television license for the Montreal area.

This we understand is beyond the terms of your reference.

THE CHAIRMAN: As long as you understand that. We can only discuss the question of the single channel policy in general terms, the question of selecting the successful applicant is fortunately not something we have to concern ourselves with.

MR. DUPONT: I think the intent of the paragraph is to show our function and willingness and ability to venture into television.

This brief is being submitted for the purpose of discussing the principles that are involved and the reasons behind the demands of the private radio and television broadcasters in Canada.

As a privately owned enterprise, we at CJAD feel that it is our inherent right and duty at this

time to submit the following:

Principles: CJAD exists by public approval and its function is to serve the public interest. This it does by scheduling radio entertainment of the highest possible quality and at the lowest possible cost to the advertiser.

We feel that in the conduct of our business we have an obligation to the community, which we honour by active participation in all phases of community life.

We believe in fair competition among broadcasters, so that listeners may freely select the programme of their choice.

We know and appreciate that public favour must be earned by performance; and we endeavour at all time to merit public approval. The measure of our success in this endeavour may be seen in the programme rating surveys conducted by responsible research organizations.

We recognize the necessity for broadcast regulations in Canada; but we submit that such regulations need not be such as to stifle the progress and development which can come when all those in a competitive field are governed by the impartial application of regulations in the public interest.

We feel that these ideals are of a positive nature and contribute to the growth of Canadian broadcasting.

CJAD, like all privately owned broadcasting

stations in Canada, operates under the provisions of the Radio and Broadcasting Acts. It maintains its corporate operations by virtue of a provincial charter.

Although our governments are democratic, there are times when undemocratic results can accrue from democratic procedures. Not every Act or proceeding of an elected parliament is democratic in its ultimate result. The present situation as regards broadcasting in Canada is not at all that visualized by the parliament which passed the 1932 and 1936 Acts, and while it may have been democratic in relation to the situation they contemplated it is not democratic in relation to the situation which exists today.

The CBC provides a broadcast service and so do the privately owned stations. Obviously a listener cannot listen to both at the same time. Therefore he must choose between the services of the two, which fact naturally creates competition.

Up to this point, this is a democratic system of free competition. The CBC must compete with the private stations for audience, and this is a good thing, but the CBC is subsidized and the private stations are not. This, in itself, gives the CBC an advantage over its competitors which it should find sufficient, without the additional advantage of regulatory powers over these competitors.

When regulatory powers are added to the advantages of subsidization, the situation inevitably

becomes undemocratic and somewhat arbitrary.

Broadcast stations in Canada operate under two major Federal enactments -- the Radio Act and the Broadcasting Act.

As regards the Radio Act, administered by the Department of Transport and pertaining to the technical aspects of broadcasting, we have only one suggestion to offer -- that private stations be invited to send an accredited observer to all international conferences dealing with broadcast band revisions and allocations, and other matters likely to have a direct bearing on their operation.

Concerning the Broadcasting Act, we feel that the following facts are pertinent:

1. The Act was framed as an outcome of the Aird Report, and it was the intention of those who signed the Report that all privately owned stations would cease to exist as such and become part of the State-owned broadcasting system. The broadcasting Act was not intended to apply to the situation existing today.

2. Nevertheless, the Act provided for a national broadcasting system, not the national system. Even as the Act now stands, certainly there could be more than one national system or more than one broadcasting system within its terms.

3. Whatever the intent of the Act, there are in fact two broadcasting systems in Canada today -- one owned by the CBC with its chain of stations and networks, the other owned by the private stations, but controlled by the CBC. It is recognized that a

network must lay down certain operating and programme content regulations to govern its own network. It does not, however, require regulatory powers over stations which are often in competition with it. Such powers could best be provided by an independent regulatory body which is not in competition with either the CBC or the private stations.

The Commission has heard some criticism of commercials from labour groups -- criticism presumably offered without the realization that commercials sell goods, which in turn creates jobs.

Since the private stations are not subsidized by public funds, it stands to reason that any private station which becomes commercial to the extent that people tune it out will soon find itself bereft of revenue, since advertisers do not spend their money with stations which have no audience. On the other hand, many commercials are interesting and informative, playing an important role in the Canadian economy by helping to create markets for goods.

As regards the regulation of commercials, it is our view that the public itself is the best regulatory body. The public can -- and does -- regulate commercials very quickly by turning to another station whenever either the calibre or the volume of commercial announcements offends it.

It has been said on occasion that it would not be fair to allow large centres like Montreal to have a second television station when smaller areas

do not have any station at all. This seems to be on a par with saying that large centres should have only one post office because many small centres have only one.

Even granting the validity of the argument, it applies only when relating to the use of public funds for television stations. It has no validity at all when relating to funds which private capital might provide.

A second English TV channel is very much desired by viewers of the Montreal area -- as evidenced by the fact that such viewers now turn to Mount Washington, Burlington and Plattsburg for the alternate choices they desire. CJAD has the desire and the capital to provide the second channel. Permission to proceed would contribute to the development of a larger pool of talent, creating work opportunities for clerical, technical and artistic groups.

To summarize: we believe that radio and television in Canada should be supervised by an independent regulatory body, which through parliament could interpret or revise the Broadcasting Act to conform with present conditions. This being done, radio and television in Canada -- state-owned and privately-owned alike -- will grow and prosper side by side; diversified, but with a common purpose -- to give to Canadians the best from Canadian, United States and European centres of culture and entertainment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Dupont. Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Dupont, on page 5 of your main brief you refer to your CBS affiliation which was granted to you in 1948, could you tell us something about the nature of that affiliation, whether you got the whole of the CBS network or whether there are rules and regulations laid down by the CBC as to how much CBS programming you could accept?

MR. DUPONT: There are no rules other than the rules that apply on programme content and acceptability as come out in the CBC rule book. Our affiliation which we had asked for at an earlier date for the purpose of solving a local problem, because in 1945 when we first started Columbia programmes were being given through the French language station and realizing that they should need more time, if not their entire time for programmes in French, we entered in an agreement between us with Columbia whereby the distribution of Columbia programmes in Montreal would be shared this way; CJAD would take all the talk programmes.

MR. COYNE: All which?

MR. DUPONT: Talk, dramatic programmes and musical programmes with English announcements. CKAC would take musical programmes but substitute French announcements, a procedure which I had personally established when I was with the CRBC. Unfortunately for myself this request was only granted in 1948. I would have liked to have it earlier, I thought it was in the public interest but it did not come about until then. Our agreement subject to CBC's approval every

year, is contingent that we only take those programmes which are for local consumption. If the programme is broadcast on the national network, although I pay the line costs from New York to Montreal, CBC takes the programme for itself or give it to an affiliate of theirs which is my competition.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But outside Montreal, you mean the other station away from Montreal.

MR. DUPONT: To illustrate the point, suppose the Woolworth Hour brought from the States and carried in Canada coast to coast, it is a CBS origination and normally it should come to me but because it is carried in Canada over a national network the CBC dominion network, it must be carried in Montreal over the CBC dominion network outlet which is CFCF.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Do you mean to say Columbia networks have certain things being heard over two stations in Montreal?

MR. DUPONT: Not at the same time but over one station and in my contention that programme I should have because I am the CBS affiliation but the CBC rules that this should be heard over theirs.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, apparently one is a delayed broadcast, is that the case.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, is this not it, when the CBC refused to take the CBS programme on a network basis you do not get it?

MR. DUPONT: I do not get it when they do not take it on a network basis I do get it.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Was your arrangement with CBS made prior to the CBC's arrangement with them?

MR. DUPONT: Naturally it had to be in order to be able to submit an arrangement to the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure you understood Mr. Stewart's question: isn't it true that CBC has been taking CBS musical programmes for many years before you were in existence?

MR. DUPONT: CKAC was taking the programme before.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I may be confused.

MR. COYNE: Subject to that limitation which you mention, whereby if CBC wants a CBS programme for network purposes, then it goes over one of their networks, is all the other CBS network material available to you?

MR. DUPONT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Any difference between commercial and non-commercial programmes?

MR. DUPONT: No difference at all. It is just a matter of local distribution.

MR. COYNE: Apart from those times when the CBS origination was being carried in Canada by one of the networks, you could operate all the time on CBS programmes; is that true? Is that literally a possibility if you chose to do so?

MR. DUPONT: Oh, yes, if we chose we could operate, literally, on all CBS shows, but it would not obtain in practice because CBS programmes have both sustaining and commercial, and the larger

number of their commercial programmes are for American consumption. It is only the exception that comes to Canada, because they are sponsored by American firms having Canadian branches.

MR. COYNE: Could you give us an indication on an average programme week how much of your programming is from CBS origination?

MR. DUPONT: Actually, since last December I haven't got one commercial programme from CBS.

MR. COYNE: You have not taken one?

MR. DUPONT: I haven't taken one commercial programme from CBS.

MR. COYNE: In other words, you have obtained programmes in Canada and put them over the air rather than take the programmes that originated in the United States?

THE CHAIRMAN: And it is more profitable for you to do so?

MR. DUPONT: It is more, but, on the other hand, one must bear in mind that these programmes in most cases are outstanding programmes, and you need them to highlight your schedule.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, you would agree with Mr. Stanton's evidence recently in the States, that one of the functions of the network programme is to increase the value of the overall content and the adjacent spots, and so forth; this is the way it works?

MR. DUPONT: A practical illustration of this was when CBC went into the commercial field,

and I had some dealings in that matter, and we began bringing into Canada such programmes as the Charlie McCarthy programme, Jack Benny, Waltz Time, Burns and Allen, and while the revenue accruing to the station was not so very high, the adjacent spots to those programmes became very valuable, and it also served this very important purpose, that those adjacent spots becoming available were requested and sought after by Canadian advertisers, and because of the proximity of those programmes it compelled the Canadian advertisers to put their best foot forward so that their own production would not suffer in comparison.

MR. COYNE: I suppose it is true in the case of an affiliation with an American network, as it is in the case of an affiliation with the CBC network, that with respect to a commercial programme you receive from the network, for the network programme, only some percentage or fraction of your regular time rate?

MR. DUPONT: It is so.

MR. COYNE: Purely from the point of view of financial return, then, but apart from any other consideration, it is more advantageous to schedule local programmes than network programmes?

MR. DUPONT: You are quite right, sir.

MR. COYNE: One proposition that has been put up to us from time to time, speaking very generally, is along these lines, that if Canadian stations were free to affiliate with American networks of their own volition and without any necessity

for consent to it, that the tendency would be for American programmes to completely drown out Canadian originations, that is, if such stations were free they would import nothing but American programmes and there would be no Canadian programmes. I think I am over-simplifying the way it has been put to us, but could you make some comments on that sort of general proposition with which I think you are probably familiar?

MR. DUPONT: The comment I could make on that is one that is in the books, that if you go over the schedule of a station having direct affiliation with an American network you will find that the percentage of American programmes is very small, and can be qualified. I say it is very small; I think in our own operation, out of say 120 or 125 hours a week, I think we take about 20 hours, and they are all very much specialized programmes in most cases. To fill a programme requirement of things not available locally, such as the New York Philharmonic or the current series going on, the Musical Festival with John Fawcett; it would also include Ed Morrow's Nightly News Review, which is enlisting possibly one of the highest shares of audience in Montreal.

MR. COYNE: Are all these sustaining programmes -- non-commercial?

MR. DUPONT: They are absolutely sustaining, and we have to pay to bring them to Montreal. We pay the line which costs in the vicinity of $7500 a year, and these are features

that you can't produce locally. Certainly we have news; we have two editors; we have all the news service and we have a news centre. I do not think there is anything which we do not exploit to get news or channels that we do not investigate, but there are viewpoints and international reports that we cannot get, and we can get into them by network affiliation. Recently there were two of the most extraordinary documents produced by Columbia. We were fortunate, by our affiliation, to be able to make those available to the public. One was the sinking of the Andrea Doria and the other was on the Suez Canal question. The Andrea Doria was a masterpiece of a document; as a matter of fact, I heard when I was in New York that it may be eligible for the present award of the year. The Suez situation, with which you are very conversant, was documented by reports from all over the world, and Columbia has possibly the highest qualified staff of news reporters and commentators of any network. Gentlemen, I ask you, isn't this in the public interest that we at CJAD at our own expense make these features available to you? The newspapers are not deprived of syndication, of a wire line to New York or to the United Press or to their own correspondents. It all goes towards our information, enlightenment and enrichment.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Did the CBC refuse to permit you to bring them in?

MR. DUPONT: No, sir.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Why didn't you bring them in?

MR. COYNE: They did bring them in.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You did?

MR. DUPONT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I thought you said you did not.

MR. DUPONT: But other stations did not. We brought them into Montreal because we had that affiliation. One must bear in mind that with the CBC network many stations across Canada are being supplied American originated programmes from one of the three or four networks, but in Montreal or Toronto the station competing with the CBC, or with another station, cannot get access to this wealth of programmes, whether they be dramatics, whether they be musical, whether they be documentary. You will recall, possibly,the one by Edward Morrow, "I Hear it Now"; it is now on television as "I See It Now", which is a wonderful documentary. The one he did on Africa recently was given a special award. These are programmes which an American affiliation makes it possible for us to give them to the public. So when I hear people criticizing our affiliation in this way I would like to have them in my operation for them to learn at first hand the meaning and the importance of that service. It is a very valuable adjunct and for that reason I would like to see it continued.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Dupont, I think you mentioned some figures in the course of your answering,

that in an average week of 125 hours of broadcasting something like 20 hours -- was that the figure you gave?

MR. DUPONT: It is about 20 hours, but it varies; it is in that vicinity. It is not more than 25, I am sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is somewhere around 18 to 20 per cent of the broadcasting?

MR. DUPONT: Take, for instance, during the American Conventions; we were listening and doing programmes all through the day, and at night we selected to make a round-up in Washington and San Francisco. Well, naturally, that week the need for that information was more urgent.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you may have had a higher percentage?

MR. DUPONT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And since last December you have not had any commercial programmes -- and these are not commercial programmes?

MR. DUPONT: Since last December I haven't had any commercial programmes from CBS.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was curious about that, because you told us a few moments ago how valuable these fine American programmes were in not only building up the saleability of the adjacent spots, but also the quality of the adjacent spots and making the Canadian programmers keep up to standard. Why do you lose this advantage now? Are they not making any more good programmes at CBS?

MR. DUPONT: They are, but they are not commercial programmes. They are sustaining programmes. We are carrying some sustaining programmes; for instance, every night between eight and eight-thirty we have a brace of mystery shows, at nine o'clock we have Ed Morrow, at nine-fifteen Johnny Dollar, and at nine-thirty Amos and Andy, which is an ever-popular feature.

MR. COYNE: But isn't Amos and Andy sponsored?

MR. DUPONT: They are available for sponsoring in certain markets, and to us it is available without sponsor.

MR. COYNE: I follow. The programme is available to you, but there is no commercial revenue available to you for carrying it unless the particular sponsor wants the network to add to his station?

MR. DUPONT: That is the picture.

MR. COYNE: And, of course, these are American firms doing the sponsoring?

MR. DUPONT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You say you carried such programmes of great interest as the sinking of the Andrea Doria, and another one on the Suez Canal. Edward R. Morrow you carry constantly; you also said some time ago in the case of the Woolworth Hour the CBC has sort of preempted that so you can't use it. You can't read CBC's mind, but can you say why they have deprived you of that Woolworth Hour but they have allowed you to carry on with the others? Is there any particular

reason? Is it out of consideration to you or is it because they are not interested, or don't you know?

MR. DUPONT: No, I don't think it is out of consideration for me at all. It is only that they made a set of rules which I don't like.

THE CHAIRMAN: But that is not the point. Mr. Turcotte is asking you why, let us say, for example, the Ed Morrow show, which you have found to be of such great interest, why doesn't the CBC provide this on its radio programmes if it has rights with CBS?

MR. DUPONT: CBC would have to answer that question.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: That is what I said -- you can't read their minds.

MR. DUPONT: No.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But you don't know?

MR. DUPONT: No, sir.

MR. COYNE: Turning now to your recommendations, and going at the outset to Recommendation No. 2, which appears on page 9 of your main brief, where you are suggesting that there should be freedom to the private stations to establish permanent networks of their own without control, it was put to us by the previous witness that it was his view that one argument against permitting private networks was that it prevented the private stations from developing national programmes which he felt the CBC was also providing,

and might cause them to neglect the concentration of their effort upon the local field where they, in his view, provide a very valuable local service. The burden of your brief, the earlier part of it, has illustrated very graphically the very real nature of the local community service that you provide in Montreal. Why do you want to do more than that, and if you were doing this network business do you think it might not affect adversely your local service?

MR. DUPONT: Mr. Coyne, I don't think it would have been used on our local service. The programme schedule is somewhat like a menu; you have to provide a variety of food.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but you can only eat so much.

MR. DUPONT: Yes, you can only eat so much, but I am coming to it. We operate 15 hours a day; we have in these periods all the time to look after local public service which I think we do fairly well, but I think there would be an opportunity to do something extra, maybe in the afternoon, maybe in the evening in a dull period, and Mr. Lalonde was mentioning yesterday, if I may refer to his record, that we applied to the Commission for authority to set up a private network; we were not given that authority, but lately we have been informed -- not myself, but it has come to me and I have checked on it and it is a fact -- that we could not get a network to broadcast news, to broadcast news commentary or

to broadcast news or recorded programming. I think it is a pity that news recording is to be restricted to one organization. The people need to know both sides -- all sides of the news -- all views.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean only this kind of national news networks, because you do produce innumerable news broadcasts -- you have already said so -- so it is not one organization in news, but it is one organization in a national news network.

Yes. Mr. Fowler, to go a point further to the point which concerns me, I have in mind this coming Fall or Winter and I would like to make it possible to broadcast nightly news from the capital. To do so there are two ways -- one is to tie up with a local station having an excellent reporter and have the same news broadcast for the two stations. Under the regulations I will not be able to do that. The other way would be for the news man to do the broascasts for us separately. I think the end results would be the same but why put difficulties into it -- I think people during the next eight or ten months will be very much interested to know what goes in Ottawa. Secondly, news commentary I think today, and included in that I mean opinion-forming, is very challenging and it is a very heavy responsibility. Not that we do engage or have any desire to engage but we would like to have some people on our network to talk about free enterprise. It has merit. Free enterprise develops this country. Why don't we give an opportunity to qualified people to express their views.

COMMISSIONER FOWLER: Well I think the CBC would probably like to get people talking on the same subject on the national network.

MR. DUPONT: I don't know how hard they are working on that side.

THE CHAIRMAN: To be perfectly frank with you I don't think that the restriction on this is a CBC restriction. It is the availability of people to talk on freedom of enterprise.

MR. DUPONT: I think our private people

are sometimes very timid about putting their complaints before the public and if you hear me raise my voice at times you will understand.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to ask you one other question on this network arising out of what Mr. Coyne was asking you previously. Is it not true that in the economics of network broadcasting you do need to have a certain number of hours in order to get a good rate. I don't remember whether it is eight or six hours or something of that sort on network broadcasting -- it is something of that order. Is it not necessary to have so many hours in order to get an economic rate. Now if that is true and you shake your head to indicate that you agree with me, and you were to take that kind of economic network operations, wouldn't that necessarily make a rather profound change in the character of your daily or weekly programmes? I mean you have said yourself that you only have 16 hours a day to work with. That 16 hours is now occupied in what you have made a very interesting way and as it has turned out a very acceptable way, apparently to the public you are reaching including such things as this Edward Morrow broadcast and the "Andrea Doria" broadcast and special things that you have and which you have told us about, that you are filling up the day. Where are you going to find these extra six hours of network. What are you going to have to throw out? My point is, is it not going to change the

character of your performance -- it might be better or it might be worse but it will be different.

MR. DUPONT: In my particular case Mr. Fowler, it might be worse or it could be better. I don't however think that that reference is made to you and was meant to apply to my own particular case. It was meant to apply to CKAC because it --

THE CHAIRMAN: No no, I am talking about your suggestion in your own brief that you would like to have the right to form networks and I am saying that if you want to have the right to form networks, you don't just want the right in abstract, you want to use it. If you are going to form networks and you are forced by these economics of the network operations to take six or eight hours on network, then the concern that you naturally feel is that this excellent service that you are giving is going to be at least different and it could be worse.

MR. DUPONT: I don't see anywhere in my brief Mr. Fowler that I have mentioned six or eight hours.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, I didn't say you mentioned six or eight hours, I am saying that you agreed with me that in order to run a network efficiently or get good rates on the lines, you have six or eight hours.

MR. DUPONT: You would naturally have better rates for six hours than you would have one-half an hour but if you bought an hour you would have quite a good rate -- quite acceptable to the plant -- because when you buy an hour for instance --

THE CHAIRMAN: No, you are a business man

Mr. Dupont and you will agree with me that if you could get a couple of hours on a network at the hourly rate and you see dangling in front of you this plum that you could get a much better rate if you go to six hours, you are likely to find ways and means of buying the six or eight hours, are you not?

MR. DUPONT: Well I start to walk before I run.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you would get up to full steam pretty fast.

MR. DUPONT: Well everybody would benefit, to go back to this line question, if my memory serves me right, a half hour is 12 cents a mile and one-hour rate is 15 cents and I think the rate of progression is 3 cents per half hour and so on.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Downward?

MR. DUPONT: Upward, 15 cents for the hour, 18 cents for the hour and a half and 21 cents for two hours.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh yes I see.

MR. DUPONT: When you put it out for only one hour then you have got a rate of about 7-1/2 cents which is a competitive rate with the CBC. Now the structure of the CBC rate is a little different to ours because the CBC buy in bulk. They buy 16 hours per day and they sell their line at a cost lower than we can buy it because they buy it in bulk, but if we approach that rate then, since we are in competition with them, and they are with us, we have a better rate to get that business and the narrower we become competitive ratewise the more

our chances are of getting a network.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can see that to but you still haven't really answered the question I am putting to you.

MR. DUPONT: I am sorry if I have not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, you have given us I may say a picture of a good programme performance in Montreal, apart from the other services you give, and one which apparently has acceptance in terms of listenership, according to the ratings. Now is it not true that the service is going to be changed the moment you go over to network operations, if you start doing Canadian network operations on a six or seven-hour basis, to get the good rates which you have just been talking about, you will have to drop things, perhaps like the Edward R. Morrow show, to take that one as an example.

MR. DUPONT: You are right there -- that would naturally effect it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course we can't judge whether it would be better or worse, but this is a change in the condition of the operations.

MR. DUPONT: Yes, it would affect it, but still it would not be our intention to operate six hours.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see.

MR. DUPONT: We would be satisfied with a good deal smaller time. There are so many features that we feel that can be developed in a small network such as might include Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto, Windsor, Hamilton and London. In Quebec, Montreal is practically the only city where you have an English language station that is not a network affiliation.

CKAC and CJQC if my memory serves me correctly, are both affiliated to the CBC Dominion network and therefore are not in need as much as we are of these programmes that are different from those we produce locally.

THE CHAIRMAN: Of course you are not without network affiliations either.

MR. DUPONT: I am very ambitious Mr. Chairman. I would like to have the best at all times and if I can get programmes in Toronto or Hamilton I would like to have them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean you do in fact bring outside things in through your CBC affiliations.

MR. DUPONT: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Let me turn to your supplementary brief for just a couple of questions. In the second paragraph on page 2 you say we recognize the necessity for broadcast regulations in Canada but we submit that such regulations need not be such as to stifle the progress and development which can come when all those in a competitive field are governed by the impartial application of regulations in the public interest. I just want to make sure that I am clear on your meaning. You have told us how successful you have been in operating under the existing regulations in building up the service and are you suggesting specifically that there are some existing regulations which have stifled progressive development?

MR. DUPONT: The regulation necessity for

broadcast regulations in Canada could have been more explicit - I think that is what is meant by technically - we are quite happy with these regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN : But you are suggesting Mr. Dupont that -- and it is quite clear from what you have said that the kind of regulations you have had tend to stifle progress and development. I refuse to regard you as an example of the stifling of progress and development - from the story you have given us.

MR. DUPONT : I was coming to that; of course the matter rather pre-occupying us most, and naturally we have had some expressions of this, is the providing of the network and secondly, particularly in this province, it is a matter of for instance, the brewery advertising.

THE CHAIRMAN : But that is not something that your independent body will do you a bit of good on.

MR. DUPONT : No Mr. Fowler, but in the regulations there seem to be two standards presently -- one for radio and one for TV. On the radio you must say "Molson's brewery presents" and not "Molson's Crown and Anchor presents" -- there is no such registration as Molson"s Crown and Anchor -- we put Molson's. We have to present such and such a programme and on CBC TV you have visual dramatization lasting between 35 and 45 minutes -- or 35 and 45 seconds. Why is the regulation governing the same product different for CBC TV than it is for radio? This is a competing

factor. I know that if I was an advertiser I would much prefer a form of advertising I could buy and get over CBC. We made a representation - we asked them for a more, what we thought, logical approach. We asked and suggested that the brewery programmes be announced this way - "Molson's Breweries - Crown and Anchor" or "Molson's Breweries and Molson's Export present" -- it is very logical as a type of presentation but apparently --

MR. COYNE : But this is a distinction surely between TV and radio. Within the radio field the CBC can't say any more about Molson's on their stations than you can on yours, can they ?

MR. DUPONT : Well if my records are right, I don't think the brewery people are buying any CBC radio -- they are buying private radio but nevertheless we are always in competition - one medium as against another. We are fighting for the advertisers' dollars.

MR. COYNE : I know, but you are making a complaint against the regulations with respect to TV. I mean, you could make a complaint against some TV station.

THE CHAIRMAN : It is really the business of regulation.

MR. DUPONT ; Yes - this is one thing that was mentioned about private networks. Another thing is the subsidization of the programmes by

-the CBC - on TV programmes. I think it is unfair competition. I don't think this country has any right to allow the Ford Motor Company or General Motors to expect or buy programmes for $8,000 which cost $10,000. If those companies cannot foot the bill that should not be allowed on the CBC TV Network.

MR. COYNE : But surely Mr. Dupont, looking at it from the point of view of the taxpayer, it is better to get $8,000 than to get nothing, is it not ? Looking at it not from your point of view, but from the point of view of the taxpayer who forms the audience, and who foots the bill ?

MR. DUPONT : Well I am a taxpayer too. I contribute to that $2,000 deficiency and plenty! My tax money goes to pay that $2,000 difference between the production costs and the selling costs.

MR. COYNE : But would you prefer to contribute to $10,000 or to $2,000 - as a taxpayer ?

MR. DUPONT : I would prefer --- I couldn't answer that. I would prefer that each medium stand on its own merit. I can go as a good medium and tell my story to General Motors and Ford and if they spend their money with us, and if we make a dollar, we will make a dollar -- the government is sure going to get its 40 to 45%.

MR. COYNE : Well one last question, if I might turn to page 4 where you are discussing the

broadcasting act -- you say in paragraph 3 "There are in fact two broadcasting systems in Canada today - one owned by the CBC with its chain of stations and networds, the other owned by the private stations, but both controlled by the CBC". Now is it quite as simple as that -- I will put it this way, where do you put the private stations which are affiliated with the CBC network -- into which system do they fall ?

MR. DUPONT : Well ---

MR. COYNE : Is it true to say - if one considers the act, that there are private stations which are network stations - is it true to say this in quite this simple fasion - that there are two systems in Canada today ?

MR. DUPONT : You have a system of private stations - if you want to call it a system.

THE CHAIRMAN : May I just stop you there -- in what possible sense are the scattered private stations a system ?

MR. DUPONT : The are not a system actually - they are a service.

THE CHAIRMAN : I am not questioning that -- but you are saying here that one system is owned by the private stations -- is that not a "loose" use of the language to talk about it as a system ?

MR. DUPONT : Well there is a difference between service and system Mr. Fowler but there are

two CBC networks, I would possibly call it the Trans Canada and the Dominion networks systems -- both controlled by the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN : No -- it was just the question that Mr. Coyne mentioned to you -- you say "there are in fact two broadcasting systems in Canada today, one owned by the CBC with its chain of stations and networkds"- which includes the Trans Canada and the Dominion I suppose, "and the other system"-- I am putting in a word here --"owned by the private stations." Now there is no system owned by the private stations is there? They are all scattered -- a group of scattered stations.

MR. DUPONT : The Dominion network, with the exception of one station in Toronto is all private stations.

THE CHAIRMAN : But that is in the first lot - the one owned by the CBC with its chain of stations and networks - the other owned by the private stations. You refer to them as two broadcasting systems. I suppose nothing very much turns on it, but how can you argue that the unaffiliated stations are properly described as being in a system at all ?

MR. DUPONT : Well the way I understand it, there is one Trans Canada network and one Dominion network.

THE CHAIRMAN : -- and then there are some

stations outside of both. I thought those were the ones you referred to as being owned by the private stations -

MR. DUPONT: The nuance there - the difference there, is between the Trans Canada network - the majority of the stations being owned by the CBC, while the Dominion network - with the sole exception of Toronto - owned by the private networks.

MR. COYNE : I have one other question, if you will bear with me --

MR. DUPONT : Certainly. With pleasure.

MR. COYNE : In the next section you propose an independent regulatory body which you suggest would promulgate and enforce general regulations applicable to all stations, whether private or public, but here you say that a network must in effect make its own regulations. Now do I take it from that that you would not contemplate that the independent regulatory body would have anything to say about the laying down of network arrangements -- that would still fall within the jurisdiction of the CBC, would it ?

MR. DUPONT : The network arrangement should be an arrangement freely entered into by the CBC - on the one part and the private stations on the other. In 1933 when I served with CRCB, we set up the first Trans-continental state-owned network. One of my early assignments was to call on stations in the Maritimes, in my district,

and in Quebec, to make an agreement with them whereby the CBC would pay the station something like 30% of their card rate to carry sustaining programmes, in their stations, and in my opinion it was one of the most successful deals or arrangements that we ever came to.

The stations were happy to have the programmes, the programmes were good and they were being paid.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Were they compelled to take them or was it optional?

MR. DUPONT: Optional.

MR. COYNE: In answer to my question you visualize it would be on a voluntary contractual basis. In other words the CBC would make arrangements with such stations as it wished.

MR. DUPONT: The formula would be that in practice and failing that coming to agreeable terms, the CBC and the private stations would appeal to the regulatory body. I am definitely opposed to asking private stations to take programmes for nothing. The railways do not carry the freight of the government for nothing. The railways do not carry the freight of the government for nothing why should private stations have to keep up equipment, meet a high standard and give its facilities for nothing? If we make a dollar the government is in partnership with us and gets 45 cents. It is a wonderful deal for the government, we provide the auditors, do the work, have the worries and give them 45 per cent and every month we send them a cheque and I think that is a good deal. I think we should not be asked to provide it for nothing.

THE CHAIRMAN: On page 9 of your brief you say in the second sentence where you are dealing with the proposition of an independent regulatory body, you say that the present system is as unfair to the CBC as it is to the private stations. Now, we will

ask the CBC how it is unfair to them, you say it is unfair to the private stations?

MR. DUPONT: It is always embarrassing to negotiate with your judge. I like to deal eye to eye, I have something to offer, I have good points, I have weaknesses, they have good points and they have weaknesses but when the judge is there it is embarrassing.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You think it is embarrassing for both sides?

MR. DUPONT: I would think so, frankly I would think so. It is one of those things that I think we could talk about at length.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I think we have covered most of the points but one other question I have is this, and it is something that keeps bothering me; you have given us a picture of a very successful operation in a very short time, ten years.

MR. DUPONT: 1924 to 1956.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am talking about the establishment of CJAD.

MR. DUPONT: But all the labour and knowledge went into that, I would not have started in 1945 without the knowledge I had, it goes back to 1924. There is a capital investment in brains, if you put it that way, in knowledge. I served my years of apprenticeship and I think I am entitled to profit from that knowledge.

THE CHAIRMAN: No one argues that at all. As far as CJAD is concerned it has developed rapidly and successfully under a system that we have got today and I find it difficult to get into my head why people

want to change the system if it works.

MR. DUPONT: Well, we feel that there should be no restriction, we should have the latitude of having to deal with a regulatory body which is not at the same time a competitor.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you must have something, you must want something, you cannot get something today that you want, otherwise why all this effort.

MR. DUPONT: Could the question be rephrased to what is the CBC trying to get by wanting to control both.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think the CBC is trying to get anything, we are trying to find out what the system really ought to be and what specifically would you obtain, what would you get, what concrete results would come if you had an independent regulatory body tomorrow?

MR. DUPONT: Mr. Fowler, as a free enterpriser and as one who has read for a long time, I have appeared before the parliamentary committee in 1932 and what I said then is exactly what I say today. I am perturbed, as a free enterpriser when I look over some of the report of the Aird-Frigon Commission and when I see the report for various countries and you come to the United States, which in my opinion, is one of the finest systems in the world and their whole set-up is dismissed in three lines while other systems in socialist countries receive half a page, three-quarters of a page and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN: That may be, that is something somebody reports one way and they put it that way but what is going to be different when you get it?

MR. DUPONT: We are going to free again, if I can put it that way.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is then, in other words, an entirely subjective argument. You have no objections, no concrete factual things that you want to accomplish that you think you will get from an independent regulatory body that you do not get from the CBC.

MR. DUPONT: Our dealings with the CBC have been very agreeable, we have areas of problems where we do not understand one another and we could not come to terms, at one time we did come to terms and in another time we did not.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would happen with the independent board?

MR. DUPONT: Yes, but it seems to us and I think these arguments have been put by other people, that the only way would be for an independent regulatory body where they could go and appeal their case honoured by the public, the same way as we would be honoured by the public. The organization of the CBC does today the best possible job and without any conflict and one has to decide if they have something that interests them and something that interests private stations, I think that is too much to ask to sit back and say to the other fellow, "You take it".

THE CHAIRMAN: That is all subjective still. I want to know what concrete things you want to accomplish, what do you think you could do with an independent regulatory body that you cannot do with the CBC? What results do you want to receive other than those, as someone said out west, that they would feel better.

MR. DUPONT: That is something in the free enterprise system and I seem to go back and labour the point, even in the radio field, it is a great medium and frankly I do not think we have accomplished 50 per cent of what we will accomplish because there are new vistas being opened in radio, operation, programming, information and so on and to do that and to do it well and to do it for the public we must have the same rules, the same yardstick for both organizations. Competition is the best thing that can happen. If we had not had to roll up our sleeves to meet the competition of our competitor we may not have achieved what we did achieve.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On the other hand, Mr. Dupont: I think you would agree that in the light of the regulations which govern the CBC, that is the Act itself, that they are at least only a limited competitor. Now, on page 3 of your supplementary brief you say the CBC must compete with the private stations for audience and this is a good thing that the CBC is subsidized and the private stations are not. Now, it was only yesterday when the Association of University Teachers were here that Prof. Frank Scott read out a list of the almost prohibitive regulations governing CBC as to what they want to produce. Now, unfortunately I have not got Prof. Scott's submission in front of me but the list contained so many programmes that they have to put on the air which I think could not have been sponsored that to that extent they are limited competitors of yours. They must be subsidized and

certainly I would think that a great many of the private stations today would not be on the air if their ability to broadcast was qualified in the way that CBC's policy is. Would you agree with that?

MR. DUPONT: My statement about the subsidized station is a statement of fact and not a complaint.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: It is a statement of fact but what I am getting at is whether or not it is proper in view of the qualifications under which the CBC are operating, whether it is proper that they should be subsidized, otherwise I do not see how they could operate nor could a private station operate if they had to produce these programmes which the government insists the CBC produce.

MR. DUPONT: I agree with you.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: So, apparently since they are not sponsorable they have to put a lot of their time into non-productive effort.

THE CHAIRMAN: Might not that be what is being subsidized?

MR. DUPONT: I should like to see possibly a larger subsidization to the CBC conditional to their vacating the commercial field.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have no doubt you would, you do not surprise me a bit.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But I tell you as a taxpayer I might object to that.

MR. DUPONT: I can understand but, on the other hand, one would have to see how productive, that would be quite a problem, how productive and remunerative

and profitable is the CBC operation. Unquestionably Prof. Scott has a good point when he says the CBC should produce more of the cultural type of programme.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: They are forced to produce those and I am asking you whether or not there is a good reason to be subsidized.

MR. DUPONT: There is no question in my mind.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: And also because of the wraps under which CBC are operating by reason of the mandate from the government that they are only limited, I won't say to what extent, but limited competitors of yours for audience.

MR. DUPONT: Well, we are competitors at all times.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I am asking you would that be a reasonable statement because after all they are the kind of programme that you would not produce by and large, you would not produce them because they would not command the audience.

THE CHAIRMAN: When they are producing these programmes they are not competing.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, they are not competing with you and I am trying to find out from you whether that is correct.

MR. DUPONT: That is very true, these programmes have to be paid for and the only way they can be paid for is by subsidy and they have to be paid by government grants.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Dupont, it has been a most interesting discussion and we appreciate

your coming and also your having been here during part of this week. I also thank your two associates. We have one more brief this afternoon but as we have been sitting since 9.30 this morning I think perhaps we should break now for about 5 minutes and we will start with the brief of the University of Laval and finish that this afternoon.

---A short recess.

L-328
5PM

Montréal, 14 septembre 1956.

Mémoire soumis par

L'Université Laval de Québec

---

Ont comparu:

Mgr Alphonse-Marie Parent,

M. M. Giguère M. Napoléon Leblanc

---

THE CHAIRMAN: Our next brief is that of Université Laval. We will mark your memorandum as Exhibit No 199.

EXHIBIT NO 199: Submission by Université Laval.

You have provided us with a summary, and in the presentation of this brief we are glad to have it in either French or English. As far as reading goes, Mr. Stewart and I follow it, and, if you speak slowly enough, we follow you in spoken French too.

MGR PARENT: Of course, I should prefer to read it in French.

THE CHAIRMAN: The only thing is, Mr. Stewart and I will have to question you in English, but you may reply in French.

MGR PARENT: Monsieur le Président,

messieurs les Commissaires, Au nom de l'Université Laval, de Québec, j'ai l'honneur de soumettre respectueusement à votre Commission ce mémoire sur certains problèmes que posent la radio et la télévision au Canada et sur la part que pourrait prendre l'Université dans le développement et le progrès de ces deux moyens d'éducation populaire.

La Radio et la télévision dans la société canadienne. Au cours des trente dernières années, le Canada a progressivement élaboré un système de diffusion nationale qui devait contribuer au développement d'une culture canadienne. En toute occasion, les Canadiens n'ont cessé de réclamer une radio vraiment canadienne, sous le légitime prétexte qu'ils ne pouvaient demeurer plus longtemps tributaires de la culture américaine. La grande mission de la radio fut de réunir les Canadiens et de les aider à voir, à travers les différences régionales et culturelles, les valeurs fondamentales qu'ils ont en commun et à en jouir. La télévision devra continuer cette mission en ne perdant pas de vue que le Canada est et doit rester un pays à deux cultures. Ainsi le veulent les traités, l'esprit de la constitution canadienne, et le droit naturel. Le Canada doit chercher la perfection de sa civilisation dans l'excellence de ces deux cultures, qui bien que nettement différentes, doivent s'appuyer l'une sur l'autre, se développer parallèlement et s'enrichir

mutuellement tout en restant elles-mêmes. Elles ne peuvent, en effet, se fondre l'une dans l'autre sans perdre leur valeur de culture. Le devoir du Canada est d'utiliser au maximum les richesses spirituelles de ces deux cultures au profit de l'homogénéité d'une civilisation unique qui devra réfléter le génie propre de chacune des deux races qui ont bâti le pays. La raison en est que la civilisation n'est pas seulement une pensée comme la culture, mais c'est la vie de la nation, Or, si le Canada doit être une nation, il est nécessaire que la vie canadienne soit une. Mais cette unité n'interdit pas la présence dans cette vie de deux courants de pensée et de deux langues qui manifestent l'action de deux cultures très vivantes. L'unité dans la diversité, telle doit être la formule de la vie canadienne; l'unité de civilisation dans la diversité des cultures et des langues.

La coexistence de deux grandes cultures au Canada est un fait dont nous nous réjouissons parce qu'elle constitue l'un des éléments importants de notre bien commun. S'il est désirable que ces deux cultures s'épanouissent librement, elles ne sauraient cependant contribuer à l'édification d'un patrimoine commun, si elles n'ont pas l'occasion de se rencontrer. C'est pourquoi il devient de plus en plus nécessaire de présenter les uns aux autres les deux groupes culturels qui existent au Canada. Ils y trouveront l'occasion de se mieux connaître

mutuellement, de comprendre les raisons qui motivent leur attitude devant les problèmes d'intérêt commun et de découvrir par eux-mêmes la valeur de leur contribution à l'enrichissement de la vie canadienne.

C'est à cette tâche que le Service National de Diffusion et l'Office National du film se sont consacrés au cours des dernières années. La radio, celle de langue anglaise aussi bien que celle de langue française, a certainement contribué au progrès de leur culture respective. Et autour de la radio se sont multipliées les collaborations d'organismes bénévoles désireux de tirer un meilleur profit des ressources culturelles qu'elle mettait à leur disposition. Déjà la télévision, grâce à des moyens d'action infiniment plus variés et plus souples, est devenue pour la majorité des Canadiens l'une des principales sources de nourriture intellectuelle. Non seulement la télévision rejoint le spectateur dans ses intérêts et dans ses goûts, mais elle lui propose des intérêts nouveaux et le sollicite en toute direction. En outre elle accomplit des fonctions d'un ordre identique à celui qui était jadis le domaine exclusif des institutions d'enseignement, du journal, du musée, etc. Cette situation de fait soulève d'importantes questions telles que celles-ci: La radio et la télévision sont-elles uniquement des moyens de vulgariser la culture? A quelles conditions et comment les procédés auio-visuels peuvent-ils encourager l'épanouissement d'une culture

populaire? Comment procéder et sur quels critères s'appuyer pour que la télévision apporte à la population une nourriture intellectuelle de qualité et contribue ainsi à une éducation populaire dynamique?

L'Université et la télévision. Les Universités canadiennes ont le mérite d'avoir amorcé un dialogue entre les deux grandes cultures du pays. C'est par elles, en effet, que la culture française s'est manifestée à la culture anglo saxonne, et vice-versa. En cela les Universités sont conscientes de participer, chacune selon sa compétence, à l'édification d'un patrimoine commun constitué par l'ensemble des valeurs humaines communicables.

Les Universités se sont appliquées à communiquer ce patrimoine non seulement à l'élite intellectuelle qu'elles préparaient, mais aussi à la population de leurs régions respectives. A cette fin elles ont pris une part active au mouvement d'éducation des adultes quand elles ne l'ont pas provoqué. Elles ont su imaginer des procédés grâce auxquels elles ont pu rejoindre leurs publics sur leurs propres plans intellectuels et les aider à atteindre de nouveaux paliers de connaissance et élargir leur perspective sur le monde. En cela les universités font une oeuvre culturelle. C'est pourquoi les universités ne sont pas indifférentes au progrès de la radio et de la télévision ni à certaines initiatives du gouvernement canadien comme

celle de l'Office national du film.

La Société Radio-Canada a fréquemment consulté des professeurs d'université à l'occasion de la préparation de divers programmes, quand elle n'a pas recherché leur étroite participation, soit au niveau de l'élaboration des programmes, soit au niveau de leur réalisation. Chaque fois, cependant, cette participation s'est arrêtée à des individus. Le temps est venu, croyons-nous d'articuler la participation de l'université comme telle à l'élaboration d'une politique culturelle plus cohérente qui devra inspirer à l'avenir la programmation tant à la radio qu'à la télévision. La participation de l'université permettrait alors à la Société Radio-Canada de mieux atteindre les buts qui lui sont assignés à savoir: favoriser l'unité nationale et la compréhension inter-culturelle, faire l'éducation populaire. Précisément l'une des fonctions de l'éducation des adultes consiste dans la culture du civisme. Quel devra être le contenu de cette éducation? Où puisera-t-on les connaissances indispensables à la revision des attitudes et des opinions? Sous quelles formes ces connaissances seront-elles communiquées aux citoyens? Mais l'éducation du citoyen n'est qu'un aspect de l'éducation des adultes. Celle-ci doit permettre à l'adulte d'approfondir sa condition d'homme et de le mettre en mesure de juger des nouvelles valeurs que lui propose une société dynamique. Cette fonction plus générale

de l'éducation des adultes soulève la question suivante: Quelle place doit occuper l'étude de la philosophie, des sciences sociales, de la psychologie, des arts voire la théologie, dans la vie adulte? Car ce sont là des disciplines qui affirment le goût, forment le jugement, développent des attitudes de tolérance. C'est à cette condition que l'éducation des adultes peut se traduire par un enrichissement culturel chez ceux qui y participent. Cet aspect humaniste de l'éducation des adultes fut le domaine de Radio-Collège. Comment la télévision va-t-elle l'aborder? Dans quelle mesure la télévision pourra-t-elle contribuer à la projection des ressources intellectuelles de l'Université?

L'élaboration des programmes de cette nature, s'adressant à des adultes en tant qu'adultes, doit dériver d'une analyse approfondie des conditions d'existence de la population. Or, à ce sujet, les universités sont en mesure d'apporter une contribution originale et constructive à la vie de la communauté. Les Universités peuvent en effet formuler les problèmes qui affectent l'homme contemporain et contribuer à leur clarification grâce aux confrontations judicieuses de ses spécialistes.

Pour cette raison la contribution de l'Université à la télévision peut avoir trois aspects: a) étudier ses effets sur la population, b) participer directement à la réalisation de certains

programmes et c) permettre aux radio-diffuseurs et aux téléviseurs d'apprécier la valeur culturelle de leurs travaux.

Etude de la télévision: Il existe un besoin de recherches appropriées quant aux publics atteints, quant à l'équilibre entre les différentes disciplines et les différents genres d'émissions, quant aux possibilités culturelles de ces émissions. Ces recherches sont nécessaires à la définition de la politique culturelle qui doit informer l'ensemble de la programmation. Les universités peuvent fournir les équipes de chercheurs nécessaires à la poursuite de ces travaux.

La participation directe à la réalisation de certains programmes. Dans le domaine des affaires publiques et de portée éducative, les Universités pourraient prendre une part active à la réalisation de certaines émissions, soit en direct, soit par montage sur kenescope, selon la nature des questions. Il va de soi que l'Université devrait décider en toute liberté du contenu spécifique et de la durée de ses programmes. Cependant le travail d'ensemble devrait être exécuté en étroite collaboration avec les experts de la télévision, tout en évitant que la technique prenne plus d'importance que le contenu de l'émission.

La formation du personnel: Le rendement

L-337

d'une politique culturelle, en matière de radio-télévision dépendra de la qualité du personnel qui en assurera l'exécution. C'est le personnel en dernier lieu qui devra imaginer les meilleures méthodes de véhiculer le contenu des programmes. Ici, comme en d'autres domaines, la méthode et les procédés restent liés aux idées à communiquer et aux publics auxquels on s'adresse. La puissance et la délicatesse des médiums commandent un soin particulier dans le choix du personnel. Il ne fait pas de doute que des gradués d'université, qui en ont le goût et les aptitudes, peuvent occuper dans ce domaine des postes importants. Nonobstant leur compétence au point de départ, il semble qu'ils bénéficieraient périodiquement d'une réflexion sur leur propre travail. L'université pourrait fort bien devenir le lieu de cette réflexion, si l'on organisait des cours spéciaux ou des séminars à cette fin. A ce propos, l'Université Laval maintient, depuis 1948, un cours d'été portant sur la radio, - de 1948 à 1951, - et sur la radio et la télévision depuis 1952. Ce cours est essentiellement une entreprise de collaboration entre le Centre de Culture populaire de l'Université, la Société Radio-Canada et le Service de l'Aide à la Jeunesse de la Province de Québec. Radio- Canada met ses studios de C.B.V. à la disposition de l'Université et prête les professeurs pour les matières de radio-diffusion et de télévision. De son côté, le Service de l'Aide à la Jeunesse subventionne les

cours. D'une durée de quinze jours et comprenant 90 heures de travail, ces cours visent à donner du métier aux étidiants et à les rendre conscients des responsabilités culturelles de la radio et de la télévision et de leur répercussion dans l'élaboration et l'exécution des programmes. Les 168 étudiants qui ont déjà suivi ces cours ont été unanimes à dire qu'ils y avaient trouvé l'occasion d'un enrichissement et d'une consolidation de leur expérience. Ceux de nos étudiants, qui venaient des postes de radio, y ont vu une initiative qui comblait une importante lacune. D'autres projets du même genre pourraient être entrepris à l'intention de ceux qui occupent la direction des postes de radio et de télévision.

Recommandations: Vu l'importance de la radio et de la télévision comme instruments d'éducation des adultes et de culture populaire;

Vu la place qu'occupent les universités dans la vie culturelle du pays;

Vu l'intérêt que les universités portent à l'éducation des adultes;

L'Université Laval recommande respectueusement à la Commission Royale d'enquête sur la radio et la télévision:

1- que le développement de notre système national de diffusion repose sur une politique culturelle de plus en plus cohérente qui tiennent compte du caractère bi-culturel du pays et de la diversité des publics à atteindre.

L-339

2- que l'université puisse jouer le rôle qui lui convient dans l'élaboration de cette politique culturelle et dans la réalisation de programmes pour lesquels elle est compétente.

3- que la Société Radio-Canada puisse mettre son équipement à la disposition de l'Université, soit à l'occasion de stages d'études, soit pour la mise en ondes des programmes particuliers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you Mgr Parent. You know our procedure is to ask a few questions that may rise by our Counsel or by the Commission.

Me deGRANDPRE: Monseigneur, vous faites référence à trois domaines dans lesquels l'Université pourrait jouer un rôle, à savoir: l'étude de la télévision, la participation directe et la formation du personnel. Quant à l'étude de la télévision, est-ce que je dois comprendre que cette recommandation ou cette suggestion est un résumé, si vous voulez, du mémoire qui a déjà été présenté par un groupe de professeurs de votre Université? Je ne veux pas mêler les deux, parce que je comprends qu'il s'agissait de deux mémoires différents, mais les professeurs de l'Université nous avaient fait la recommandation qu'un Conseil de recherches soit créé en collaboration avec les universités, et c'est dans le même sens, je présume, qu'on doit prendre cette recommandation?

MGR PARENT: Certainement, les profes-

seurs de l'Université sont très près de l'Université.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est parce que je me demandais s'il y avait une raison particulière, et je ne voulais pas entrer dans des domaines où je ne dois pas entrer.

MGR PARENT: Si vous voulez une réponse plus élaborée, comme je n'aime pas être le seul à parler, je demanderais à monsieur Leblanc peut-être de nous la donner, parce qu'il s'intéresse particulièrement au sujet; c'est lui qui est le directeur de nos cours de radio et de télévision pendant l'été.

M. LEBLANC: Je crois que Mgr le Recteur a répondu ce que j'aurais répondu à votre question.

Me deGRANDPRE: Les deux recommandations se touchent?

M. LEBLANC: Se rejoignent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just before we leave that Mr. deGrandpré, I was interested when the Professors of Laval at Quebec gave us this suggestion about research and it is the same thing. You told Mr. deGrandpré just now, and we have had a recommendation this morning from the Adult Education Society in which they dealt with research, and recommend that - as I understood it - the CBC should institute a Bureau of Research dealing with matters of radio and television - not only in technical things, but

L-341

in the broader field of impact and news and the future and soon.

Have you any views as to the relevant merits of this kind of research being done by an organization such as the CBC or by some other type of organization - is there, in other words, a virtue in having the research done by somebody outside the Broadcasting activity?

M. LEBLANC: Je peux vous répondre en français?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

M. LEBLANC: Dans notre idée il n'est pas question d'éliminer ou d'ignorer le travail accompli actuellement par la division de la recherche au sein de Radio-Canada. Nous pensons surtout à associer les universités parce que les universités sont situées localement, géographiquement à travers le Canada; elles ont des contacts, je dirais, peut-être plus directs avec les populations qui les entourent et de ce point de vue-là elles peuvent participer à un programme de recherches qui donnerait peut-être des résultats encore plus substantiels que si ces recherches étaient dirigées uniquement d'un bureau central. En second lieu, je crois que ça renforcirait le statut de la recherche au sein même de Radio-Canada, parce que le caractère désintéressé des résultats ou des recommandations qui se dégage-

raient de ces recherches serait difficilement attaquable.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am asking the question because it seems to me that this matter of research might be one area in which the great amount of public interest we have had in this subject - the interest of the CBC - the interest of private broadcasters - could conceivably be joined together. This is an area in which there could surely be collaboration.

MGR PARENT: Yes.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, quant à cet autre aspect de vos recommandations sur la participation directe à la réalisation de programmes, je pense qu'on avait reporté à précisément à aujourd'hui une question que j'avais demandée à Québec, à savoir si l'Université comme telle avait participé à cette série de programmes mis en ondes par Radio-Canada au cours des années, je pourrais me tromper sur les années - je crois que c'est la saison 54-55 ou la saison 53-54, au cours de laquelle on nous a informés à Toronto que l'Université de Toronto avait réalisé quelques dix programmes. Est-ce que l'Université Laval avait été invitée à faire partie de ces émissions et à y contribuer?

MGR PARENT: Je ne le pense pas.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous n'avez pas été

L-343

approchés à ce moment-là?

MGR PARENT: Non.

M. LEBLANC: Parce qu'en 1953 nous n'avions pas de télévision à Québec à ce moment-là.

Me deGRANDPRE: Je ne me souviens pas des détails, mais je sais que Radio-Canada avait organisé certains programmes il y a environ une couple d'années, et l'Université de Toronto y avait participé à dix reprises, et quelques autres universités à travers le Canada avaient également participé à cette série d'émissions et, comme telle, l'Université Laval n'avait pas été approchée?

MGR PARENT: Non, c'est trop récent, je m'en souviendrais certainement.

M. TURCOTTE: Il me semble avoir vu que Laval avait fait un programme.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'était mon impression. C'est pour ça que j'ai posé la question pour être bien sûr. A moins que les programmes aient été uniquement sur le réseau anglais.

MGR PARENT: Nous avons été invités par Radio-Canada souvent à nous produire à la radio, mais ça n'a jamais été sur une grande échelle, sur un grand programme.

Me deGRANDPRE: Et c'était surtout comme

L-344

individus que comme corps ?

MGR PARENT: Non l'Université elle-même; quelqu'un de l'Université.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que vous auriez à l'heure actuelle les facilités nécessaires pour faire des réalisations de cette nature, étant donné votre expérience dans le domaine de la radio et de la télévision acquise dans ces périodes de cours d'été?

M. LEBLANC: Voici. C'est que nos cours d'été se sont donnés avec beaucoup de dévouement de la part des professeurs qui ont travaillé, et deuxièmement, dans des conditions techniques plutôt limitées, parce que l'équipement de CBV, à Québec, surtout depuis que leur production s'est accrue, limite sensiblement les travaux de studio qui sont indispensables dans une section d'études de formation aussi courtes.

Et pour répondre à votre question: est-ce que nous sommes présentement équipés? La réponse est non, parce que ça suppose que nous ayons à l'Université des gens déjà rompus à la radio et à la télévision. Or personnellement, je n'en ai jamais fait; j'ai travaillé à réunir des spécialistes de la radio et de la télévision pour leur faire donner un enseignement répondant aux besoins d'abord -- ce sont des élèves que nous cherchions, -- et qui

étaient déjà engagés dans l'industrie de la radio en tant qu'annonceurs, directeurs de programmes, réalisateurs. Et ma fonction était de coordonner sur le plan méthodologique le déroulement en somme du travail, de telle sorte qu'il puisse aboutir à des résultats profitables pour les élèves qui s'inscrivaient à nos cours.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, c'est une question de détail, mais je me demande si vous y attachez beaucoup d'importance. A la page 13 de votre mémoire, je crois qu'on retrouve ça également dans votre résumé, en haut de la page, vous dites:"Il va de soi que l'Université devrait décider en toute liberté du contenu spécifique et de la durée de ses programmes." Quant au contenu spécifique, je comprends pourquoi vous avez inclus cette réserve; mais quant à la durée de ces programmes, est-ce que vous voulez parler du nombre d'émissions ou de la durée de chacune des émissions?

M. LEBLANC: C'est-à-dire du nombre des émissions.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous n'avez pas d'objection à entrer dans le cadre du minutage?

M. LEBLANC: Pas nécessairement, aucune objection; mais que l'objection que nous voyons présentement c'est d'être forcés peut-être par les circonstances à prendre des engagements qui dépasseraient

nos capacités, parce qu'il faut tenir compte que le corps professoral de l'Université est déjà surchargé de travail. Il y a des personnes qui pourraient en somme céder une partie de leur temps pour collaborer à des émissions destinées à la radio et à la télévision; et nous pensions surtout à ce que les Universités entrent dans le champ, qu'il puisse y avoir une sorte de coordination de la contribution des universités. Nous avons pensé et nous pensons dans notre travail à utiliser les ressources qui sont aussi bienà Montréal qu'à Québec, mais que ces ressources soient coordonnées dans un plan d'ensemble de sorte que l'Université puisse dire: "Nous pouvons accepter de produire dix émissions si nous avons l'assistance désirable, mais pas plus". Par exemple, qu'on ne soit pas tenu de remplir 26 semaines si nous croyons honnêtement que nous sommes capables de remplir dix semaines.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est dans ce cens-là?

M. LEBLANC: C'est dans ce sens-là.

Me deGRANDPRE: Maintenant, ces émissions que vous envisagez, est-ce que ça serait plutôt des émissions d'ordre culturel plutôt que des émissions d'ordre spécifiquement éducationnel, ou croyez-vous que l'Université est en mesure d'aller dans un et dans l'autre domaine?

MGR PARENT: Je crois bien qu'elle peut

aller dans l'un et dans l'autre domaine.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous n'avez pas d'objection à ce que l'université soit engagée à la fois, je parle comme corps, dans des émissions d'ordre - qu'on appelle communément d'ordre culturel, en opposition, si vous voulez, aux programmes spécifiquement éducationnels?

MGR PARENT: Non.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we asked this question in Quebec - you do give a very wide meaning to the word culture do you not?

MGR PARENT: OH, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: It really is in this sentence where you say that culture is equivalent to the life of the nation.

MGR PARENT: Civilization is the life of the nation - culture is rather the intellectual life of the nation.

THE CHAIRMA N: Yes - but you do adopt the broad meaning of the word culture?

MGR PARENT: Oh, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: That this should be part of our objective in radio and television?

MGR PARENT: Oh yes.

L-348

M. TURCOTTE: Il y a un sujet qui serait peut-être intéressant d'éclairer la Commission. Voyez-vous la possibilité pour une université comme la vôtre, aussi bien que les autres, Montréal et ailleurs, de faire rayonner l'enseignement universitaire par la voix de la radio ou de la télévision?

MGR PARENT: Nous en parlions justement en venant à Montréal, monsieur le commissaire. Je sais qu'aux Etats-Unis il s'est fait une expérience considérable cette année, sur la possibilité d'enseigner à la télévision. La pénurie des professeurs s'annonce tellement terrible, il faudra peut-être se passer du professeur et se contenter d'avoir un professeur pour un grand nombre d'étudiants. Je sais qu'ailleurs aussi -- M. Giguère me signalait cela tout à l'heure -- qu'on profite de la télévision pour enseigner aux professeurs.

M. GIGUERE: Oui, en Californie. L'American Chemical Society a fait des expériences en ce sens pour pallier à la crise des professeurs de sciences pour les groupes nombreux et ils ont fait des émissions en circuit fermé pour enseigner la chimie.

M. TURCOTTE: Qu'entendez-vous par là?

M. FIGUERE: Ils avaient une série, par exemple, de deux ou trois collèges où ils pouvaient

L-349

avoir sur le même circuit le même enseignement venant du même centre.

M. TURCOTTE: Le public ne pouvait pas le capter?

M. GIGUERE: Non.

M. TURCOTTE: C'était fait par films et c'était à la télévision?

M. GIGUERE: C'était de la télévision, oui.

M. TURCOTTE: Mais dans un rayon assez rapproché de l'Université?

M. GIGUERE: C'était dans un même état.

M. TURCOTTE: C'est déjà assez vaste.

M. GIGUERE: Oui, je crois que le circuit comprenait quelques collèges, moins de cinq; c'était simplement une tentative, une expérience qu'on faisait. Les résultats ont été en partie satisfaisants et en partie décevants. C'est encore à titre d'expérience et il faudra perfectionner le système avant qu'il soit à point. Ils ont fait ça à titre d'expérience.

M. TURCOTTE: D'après les renseignements que vous avez, cela était-il très coûteux cette façon d'opérer en circuit fermé?

L-250

M. GIGUERE: Je ne pourrais pas vous dire, monsieur le commissaire. Je pourrais trouver... les commentaires ont été publiés, les rapports ont été publiés dans un journal de la Chemical & Engineering News il y a quelques mois; je me rappelle seulement de quelques particularités et entre autre on signalait qu'un des grands handicaps de cette méthode c'est qu'elle ne permet pas à l'élève de demander des explications, et aussi un autre handicap qui venait du cas particulier de la chimie, c'est que l'absence de couleurs -- ça peut influencer beaucoup, surtout dans les démonstrations,-- il y avait des démonstrations qui étaient absolument impossibles, et la coloration joue aussi. Alors, il est évident que la télévision ne pourra jamais remplacer complètement.

M. TURCOTTE: Laissons la télévision de côté, il y a le côté radio aussi. Croyez-vous possible, par exemple, de faire un enseignement proprement universitaire, s'adressant uniquement à des étudiants qui pourraient plus tard subir des concours, dans le domaine, par exemple, de l'Histoire, des sciences sociales, de l'économie politique?

MGR PARENT: Il me semble que c'est plus difficile à la radio qu'à la télévision. Le fait de ne pas voir les professeurs -- et tous les professeurs vont au tableau -- et je pense que pour l'enseignement des mathématiques, l'enseignement de

certaines autres sciences il faudra peut-être en venir là dans les villes où on pourra grouper des élèves; c'est-à-dire ils sont en classe et ils n'auront qu'à suivre le cours d'un même professeur.

M. GIGUERE: J'avais remarqué qu'il fallait des professeurs beaucoup plus dynamiques, plus acteurs que les professeurs en général pour retenir l'intérêt de l'auditoire à la télévision qu'il n'en faut dans une salle de cours, parce que l'intérêt tend à diminuer plus vite en surveillant un écran de télévision qu'en voyant évoluer une personne.

M. TURCOTTE: Croyez-vous maintenant aussi que l'Université peut jouer un rôle assez important dans le domaine de l'éducation des adultes tel qu'on le conçoit déjà aujourd'hui par le truchement de la télévision ou de la radio? Est-ce que c'est ce que vous avez en vue lorsque vous parlez de collaboration?

MGR PARENT: Je ne sais pas. Le nombre de nos comédiens est assez limité à l'Université. Ceux que nous avons ont tendance à s'en aller.

M. TURCOTTE: Vous songez toujours à la télévision. La radio aussi peut jouer un grand rôle.

MGR PARENT: C'est ce qui est arrivé avec Radio-Collège avec grand succès. C'était donné par des professeurs de l'Université ou des collèges.

M. TURCOTTE: Mais l'initiative ne venait pas de l'Université?

MGR PARENT: Non; elle ne pourrait pas venir de l'Université si l'Université n'avait pas un octroi considérable pour le faire aussi, parce que c'est très dispendieux.

M. TURCOTTE: Vous parlez en troisième lieu dans vos recommandations, à la fin :"Et que la Société Radio-Canada puisse mettre son équipement à la disposition de l'Université soit à l'occasion de stages d'études ou soit pour la mise en ondes des programmes particuliers".

MGR PARENT: Elle le met déjà mais ça pourrait être beaucoup plus complet en ce qui nous concerne.

M. TURCOTTE: Qu'entendez-vous par là: "Pour la formation de ce personnel""Pour des fins éducatives, pour dresser des compétences". Est-ce cela que vous voulez dire?

MGR PARENT: Certainement. Comme cela se fait partiellement pendant les cours d'été, de façon très limitée parce que, paraît-il, les studios de Québec ne sont pas très nombreux.

M. TURCOTTE: Ils sont probablement très affairés.

M. LEBLANC: Oui, très affairés; il n'y en a qu'un en fait. Il faut dire que Radio-Canada,

L-353

depuis 1948, a mis sans charge aucune tout son équipement technique à notre disposition pour la durée de nos cours d'été. Les étudiants pouvaient exécuter les travaux qu'ils pouvaient exécuter en tenant compte de l'horaire de CBV. Alors, si nous songeons par exemple à étendre et à améliorer cet enseignement-là, l'étendre sur une période plus longue, organiser davantage et d'une façon plus systématique les travaux de studio en équipe, par exemple, lorsque nous avons des gens qui sont principalement intéressés à la réalisation des programmes, alors que d'autres sont intéressés tout simplement à l'annonce ou au travail qui tourne autour de l'annonce, eh bien, ces gens-là, s'ils font, par exemple, des intervious, s'ils ont à préparer des communiqués, ces gens-là aiment à travailler, et actuellement nous sommes obligés de séparer les groupes en deux. Alors un groupe perd du temps pendant que l'autre travaille; l'autre se presse pour donner une chance à l'autre. Ca réduit un peu le rendement que ces élèves pourraient donner si nous avions à notre disposition tout l'équipement voulu pour pouvoir les faire travailler simultanément.

M. TURCOTTE: Votre université a-t-elle déjà songé à la création d'une sorte de chaire, si on peut l'appeler ainsi, d'enseignement de technique de radiodiffusion?

MGR PARENT: Ce que nous avons actuelle-

ment c'est une chaire qui fonctionne pendant deux semaines tous les étés.

M. TURCOTTE: Croyez-vous qu'il y aurait lieu de l'étendre dans le temps, croyez-vous que ça serait suivi par un nombre suffisant d'étudiants pour justifier la chose?

M. LEBLANC: C'est le problème. Voyez-vous, nous avons eu en moyenne chaque année une vingtaine d'étudiants qui se sont inscrits depuis 1948. Sur ce nombre le tiers venait des postes de radio et les deux autres tiers, il y avait des étudiants au niveau secondaire, des élèves de réthorique et de philosophie qui ont pris des cours afin de se faire une idée de ce qu'étaient les exigences du métier -à la radio et quel genre de formation complémentaire ils devraient se donner pour entrer dans la radio et y accomplir une tâche satisfaisante. Nous avons eu des comédiens et des comédiennes qui voulaient tout simplement se familiariser avec les moyens de la radio et de la télévision, avec l'intention d'exercer en somme leur art vers la radio et la télévision; et nous avons également eu des....

M. TURCOTTE: Est-ce que c'étaient des étudiants régulièrement inscrits à l'Université dans d'autres domaines aussi?

M. LEBLANC: Nous en avons eu qui étaient inscrits à la Faculté des Lettres, qui étaient ins-

crits à la Faculté de Philosophie, nous en avons eu qui étaient en rhétorique ou en philosophie au niveau secondaire; nous avons eu des étudiants en sciences sociales et de fait quelques-uns d'entre eux sont actuellement à la télévision.

MGR PARENT: Je pense bien que si les postes même de télévision et de radio trouvaient utile d'employer davantage de nos étudiants, ceux qui ont des aptitudes évidemment, ça encouragerait le cours lui-même; ça vaudrait la peine de créer une chaire pour préparer davantage nos étudiants.

M. TURCOTTE : Vous dites "si". Cela n'a pas eu lieu encore?

MGR PARENT: Ca se fait de façon plus ou moins sohérente. Il y a des étudiants qui vont quelques-fois à la télévision, d'autres à la radio. On n'a peut-être pas eu le souci particulier de les encourager.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'est à savoir lequel des deux doit arriver le premier. Est-ce que vous devez créer la chaire pour améliorer le niveau du personnel ou si la chaire attend...

MGR PARENT: Ca doit se faire ensemble. Vous comprenez qu'un étudiant est attiré à un cours que s'il y entrevoit des résultats. Un vient à la médecine parce qu'il y voit une carrière; au Droit aussi; aux sciences sociales de plus en plus, parce

qu'on y voit une carrière. Ca serait la même chose: il viendra à un cours comme ça comme on va à un cours de langues, si on pense pouvoir s'en servir.

M. LEBLANC: En 1953 j'ai visité WOI-TV en Iowa, j'y ai passé une semaine pour précisément voir de quelle façon ils avaient organisé leur programme de formation pour les gens qui se destinaient à la radio et à la télévision. Or ce sont des matières qui sont considérées comme des "Minor". Ces personnes-là graduent dans un domaine, soit l'économique, la sociologie, l'Histoire, etc. mais ont l'occasion, parce que l'Université possède sa station de radio et de télévision, ils ont l'occasion de faire du travail pratique.

M. TURCOTTE: Et cet organisme où vous êtes allé?

M. LEBLANC: WOI-TV, qui est la station de l'Université de l'Iowa State College of Agriculture, à Ames. Et d'ailleurs, ils ont été pionniers dans ce domaine-là, et le Fund for Adult Education a versé des montants assez substantiels pour leur permettre de faire des recherches dans le domaine de la radio et de la télévision pour des fins d'éducation populaire. Ils ont monté des kinescopes, par exemple, assez formidables sur les problèmes de bien-être. Ensuite j'ai été à même de voir une série d'émissions organisées et qui avaient pour titre "Our Heritage". Alors, le soir que j'étais là

L-357

l'émission portait sur les années de l'Histoire des Etats-Unis, les années 1930, alors, les années de crise, où on a essayé d'illustrer quelle avait été la répercussion de la crise sur les arts, sur la musique, sur la peinture, sur le théâtre, sur les politiques du gouvernement et sur les problèmes sociaux qui en étaient résulté. Alors dans une demi-heure j'ai trouvé que c'était un excellent bijou, une émission très bien préparée, très bien présentée.

M. TURCOTTE: A la télévision?

M. LEBLANC: Oui, à la télévision. Maintenant, ceux qui en étaient responsables, qui avaient travaillé à cette émission-là, la production était en avance d'une année et demie. C'est une émission qui était subsidiée à titre de recherches par le Fund for Adult Education.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have just one final question on your first recommendation on page 5 - as I translate it, you suggest that the developement of our national Broadcasting system would rest on a cultural policy which would be more and more coherent, and takes into account all the bi-cultured character of the country, and the diversity of the Public sought to be reacted. Would you say that that had pretty generally the policy that had been applied up to now - perhaps not as coherenty as it might be - but is it really fair to say that you recommend the

L-358

continuation of the present approach?

MGR PARENT: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Monseigneur, we thank you very much and we appreciate your coming here.

- - - - - - -

(page No. 5655 follows)

# ROYAL COMMISSION

# ON

# BROADCASTING

## HEARINGS

HELD AT

MONTREAL, P.Q. September 15, 1956

V. 34

# ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Montreal, Quebec.
Saturday,
September 15th, 1956.

PRESENT:

| | |
|---|---|
| MR. ROBERT M. FOWLER | Chairman |
| MR. EDMUND TURCOTTE | Commissioner |
| MR. JAMES STEWART | Commissioner |

- - - -

| | |
|---|---|
| MR. JOHN M. COYNE<br>MR. A. J. de GRANDPRE | Counsel |

- - - - -

| | |
|---|---|
| MR. PAUL PELLETIER | Secretary |

- - - - -

APPEARANCES:


| | Page |
|---|---|
| National Council of Women of Canada.<br>Mrs. E. Turner Bone. | 5655 |
| Canadian Association of Consumers.<br>Mrs. H. E. Vautelet | 5676 |
| L'Association Professionelle des Industriels<br>M. Claude Lavery<br>M. Henri Dagneault<br>M. Wilfrid Girouard<br>M. Aime Laplante | 5717 |


---

SUBMISSION OF
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN OF
CANADA

Appearances:

Mrs. E. Turner Bone, Past President

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Turner Bone, you are presenting the brief?

MRS. TURNER BONE: Yes, I am.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you all by yourself today?

MRS. TURNER BONE: All by myself -- like a lamb to the slaughter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't know if you were here before during the week and have seen our procedure, but we do ask you to present your briefs either by reading them or by summarizing them -- yours is quite short, and perhaps we could just proceed to the questions afterwards if we want to develop anything further or put opposite points of view to you for your comments. So we will begin by marking your brief No. 200.

EXHIBIT NO. 200: Brief of National Council of Women of Canada.

MRS. TURNER BONE: I will submit the brief and will omit the first little paragraph.

The National Council of Women is a Federation of women's organizations, engaged in voluntary work. It is made up of professional,

religious, ethnic and cultural groups, non-partisan and non-sectarian, joined together for strength in a common cause -- that of working for "the best good of our homes and the nation" under the Golden Rule.

It is organized throughout Canada on the National, Provincial and Municipal levels; is sixty-three years old, and represents an estimated 600,000 women.

It has fifty member councils throughout Canada, and is one of thirty-six National Councils of Women which are united in the International Council, which is the oldest and largest of women's international voluntary organizations and holds consultative status with United Nations. The National Council of Women of Canada also has its own accredited Liaison Officer with United Nations.

The National Council of Women has a constant interest in the development of Canadian television and radio, not only because the Canadian people have large sums of money at stake in these media, but also because women form the great majority of their daytime audience, as well as a large section in general listening hours. In September 1955, there were 1,500,000 TV homes in Canada, and 3,700,000 radio homes. It also recognizes the influence of both radio and TV on women everywhere. It knows that broadcast programmes are the chief link with the outside world for thousands of mothers with young children, and for older people, and the type of programme that goes into such homes has an important formative effect on the character of

these individuals, their homes and the nation.

When broadcasting was first set up in Canada, women in Council looked to our networks to provide programmes which would build national unity and interpret regional viewpoints, as well as develop Canadian musical, dramatic and literary talent.

We commend the work the CBC has done in this area. We are convinced there never was a time in the nation's history when such TV and radio programmes were more necessary for the information of all our citizens, including the large groups of our newer Canadians. Even so there are parts of Quebec, Northern New Brunswick, Northern and North-western Ontario, Southern Alberta, including parts of Calgary, Kootenay and Okanagan section of British Columbia, which have no CBC coverage. We feel it most essential that men and women in all parts of the country be kept in touch with national and international affairs, so that there will be an informed public opinion in all parts of Canada to support policies in helping with the economic growth of our country, and its new international status.

For the above reasons we offer the following recommendations:

1. For both TV and radio programmes, we realize it is cheaper to import entertainment programmes from Hollywood and New York, and political opinions from Washington. Nevertheless, we urge that network programmes be mainly Canadian. We are confident that Canadian talent will be

developed for TV, just as CBC radio has given opportunity to Canadian musicians, composers, writers and actors.

2. We urge the Commission to give practical consideration as to how privately owned stations can make a greater contribution to developing and maintaining local Canadian talent, both for greater programme variety, and also as a community service.

3. We commend discussion programmes, press conferences and United Nations programmes on TV and radio, as presented by the CBC and some privately owned stations. But we deplore the use by some stations of "packaged news". This often starts off with a railway wreck in Timbuctoo and continues with murders outside Canada. We also commend the trend towards using women speakers on such panels as above, as we believe it brings in added viewers and listeners among women who do not habitually follow such programmes, as well as strengthening their confidence in women's judgment on public affairs.

4. The use of query and give-away programmes is very popular. We think questions on Canadian history, politics and sport, would be more acceptable to the listener, than the predominantly American subjects.

5. We approve the principle of alternative listening. It is pleasant for an audience in all parts of the country to have choice of programmes; but because of the need referred to above

for programmes of national content, we would point out that alternate listening in the most valuable Canadian sense is not available when the only choice for listeners is between two local stations featuring mainly recorded entertainment.

We would therefore urge that the Commission give practical consideration to extending radio networks by any means such as additional stations or step-up boosters, until national programme service is available (within reason) to all Canadian communities. For example, we are informed that some of the new northern towns, which are provided with many technological gadgets to make homemaking less burdensome, are entirely isolated from national radio entertainment and information. They are served with tape recordings made months in advance.

For the same reasons we also urge that the Canadian TV network be completed as soon as possible, and that CBC then set up more basic stations across Canada, so that alternate viewing may include programmes of national scope, as well as presenting to the rest of the country the news and views of Canadians in these additional areas.

6. TV requires an increasing expenditure and absorbs an increasing proportion of advertising revenue. We therefore request the Commission to consider how the quality of radio programmes shall be maintained, as radio receivers are in twice as many Canadian homes as TV sets.

7. We commend the use of the fine school broadcasts but think it would be wholesome

to give opportunities to provinces other than Ontario to produce some of the national programmes, that is, Quebec and the way we handle French.

8. We suggest that a programme of TV school broadcasts for classroom viewing continue to be studied, as recommended by the National Committee on School Broadcasting.

9. We commend CBC's daytime radio service to women in Trans-Canada Matinee and through the regional women commentators, not only for the content of these programmes, but for the fact that the same high level of programme service is given to women in all ten provinces. Now that is out of date because television has already set up their open house. We urged a parallel programme -- they have now put that on, so we can just say it is fait accompli.

10. Because much family discord is due to money difficulties, and because women spend 85 per cent of the consumer dollar, we commend the CBC radio programmes presenting authoritative information, separate from sales promotion, on consumer goods and services, and other economic facts. We urge that CBC television provide a similar service.

11. Because of greater possibility of unemployment of unskilled labour, as well as the advance of automation and electronics presently taking place, we urge that CBC give serious consideration to frequent TV and radio programmes educating parents and young people on

the value of young people taking training at a trade school, or through the apprentice system, or both, so they will be better equipped to earn a living and have the security and discipline of having mastered a skill. Such training will also improve the quality of our national output of goods and services.

We cite this as an example of a constructive way in which public funds could be used in providing a national radio and television programme service.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, Mrs. Turner Bone, I think we might proceed with the questions. Would you like to begin, Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Mrs. Turner Bone, could you give us a brief outline as to how this brief was prepared; that is, as to whether a committee was set up or whether it was submitted to the branches, or just the general manner in which you proceeded?

MRS. TURNER BONE: Yes, there was a committee set up. We have a chairman on radio for the whole of Canada, who was selected by the Council across Canada, and she instigated the brief and she had her reports over a period of years from her councils. She did not specifically send out a questionnaire on this matter; she used the material that she had given to her as chairman, because we didn't have time to send out and get back a questionnaire by the time we heard the Commission were ready for briefs. We therefore used the chairman of that committee, a former

chairman of the radio committee, who was a chairman for five years, and myself who was president for five years, and we compiled the brief -- the three of us. Then I took it to the Annual Meeting in Kingston last year and I asked the people if they would like to send in additional points that we hadn't covered. There were no additional points so we brought it forward as is.

MR. COYNE: I see. So that really what you have done is to attempt to put forward a summary of the views of your various Councils.

MRS.TURNER BONE: That is right. I think, Mr. Coyne, you have probably heard briefs from some of the provincial councils themselves?

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MRS. TURNER BONE: On their local situation?

MR. COYNE: Yes. Well, then, if we might turn to your recommendations which start at the bottom of page 2, you speak of importations from Hollywood and New York, and you say:

> "Nevertheless, we urge that network programmes be mainly Canadian. We are confident that Canadian talent will be developed for TV,"

and so on. Have you any specific recommendations or views as to how this should be done -- that is, should there be some control or regulation?

MRS. TURNER BONE: I don't think we had in mind any kind of control, but I suppose public taste and public opinion is the controller that

the broadcaster looks for. I personally perhaps am rather sensitive to having too much importing from the United States -- certainly it irritates me on the news broadcast and I get really high blood pressure sometimes when I hear it, but as far as other programmes go I think we feel we are off on the right foot now if we continue that way.

MR. COYNE: At the present time the CBC exercises a control over the networks.

MRS. TURNER BONE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: In fact, as you probably know, no station can operate as part of chain or network except with the consent of the CBC, and of course regular networks are the CBC networks?

MRS. TURNER BONE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Are you suggesting that that situation should be in any way changed to accomplish this greater level of Canadian content, or are you satisfied with the system as it is today?

MRS. TURNER BONE: Well, I think that the system as it is operating will be growing on the lines that we have been shown, because certainly, I think we as Canadians are very grateful for the training that young actors, for example, have received from radio programmes in Canada, so that they were able to put on Stratford, for instance, and to be invited to Edinborough. I think that shows we have a medium in our country which can train our own talent so that entertainment can emanate from Canada.

MR. COYNE: Well, in the second

recommendation at the top of the next page you urge that the Commission should give practical consideration as to how privately owned stations can make a greater contribution to developing and maintaining local Canadian talent, both for greater programme variety, and also as a community service. Again I am asking you whether you had in mind any specific steps that might be taken towards that end, or are you merely expressing a general view as to a matter which should be given consideration?

MRS. TURNER BONE: Well, it seems to us that the private stations don't give quite as much opportunity to Canadian talent as the CBC has done -- at least it is not publicly known if that is true that they have.

MR. COYNE: Well, we have been told, on the other hand, Mrs.Turner Bone, there are several explanations of that -- for example, one is the fact, or so it is represented to us, that private stations cannot form their own networks and therefore are not in a position to spread the cost of a Canadian live programme over a wide area of distribution.

MRS. TURNER BONE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Another thing that is pointed out is that a listener will only listen to good talent, and if the CBC is putting on network talent the private stations have to look to equivalent talent in order to make a new audience -- they cannot serve up amateurs if everyone turns them off.

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. COYNE: Would you say that the Council had any particular views as to specific aspects of a problem of that kind?

MRS. TURNER BONE: I don't think so, except that they think perhaps in local communities the local stations might do something more for local talent, but there again, I listened to Mr. Dupont yesterday, and he said that you must have a good name to sell your programme. Therefore, in smaller communities it is perhaps not possible to secure a good enough professional talent to measure up against what he can bring in. He didn't mention Montreal, but I am thinking perhaps of stations generally. One can see where it would perhaps be better not to have inferior talent. It is quite a problem in a country this size, really.

MR. COYNE: Quite a problem, I think, yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Before we leave that subject, Mr. Coyne, it has been suggested to us, Mrs. Turner Bone, that if the private broadcaster were permitted to form networks he might be able possibly to develop talent that is lying fallow at the moment.

MRS. TURNER BONE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Has your Council given any consideration to whether or not that question of regulation might be amended to permit the private operators to form networks?

MRS. TURNER BONE: No, I don't think so.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: And thus give you exactly what you want to hear -- better listening and alternate programmes?

MRS. TURNER BONE: I don't think they really went into the mechanics of it at all. I think they have just expressed a wish that Canadian talent be encouraged more than it has been. Think back further - away from the present - they have developed quite a bit, really.

MR. COYNE: Well, then, going on to your recommendation No. 5, where you say:

> "We approve the principle of alternative listening. It is pleasant for an audience in all parts of the country to have choice of programmes; but because of the need referred to above for programmes of national content, we would point out that alternate listening in the most valuable Canadian sense is not available when the only choice for listeners is between two local stations featuring mainly recorded entertainment."

MRS. TURNER BONE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: As you know, in the TV field at the moment there is a specific policy which is called the single-channel policy, under which a single television station only is licensed in different communities. Does your Council have any specific recommendations to make as to whether or not this is a bad policy or should be changed or should be maintained?

MRS. TURNER BONE: I think they said that the television is a pretty expensive medium that we have with us and are going to have to have. No,

they haven't really come up with anything. We have a television chairman now added to our lot, and we were most concerned about the type of programming and the type of advertising we were going to get on TV, and about three or four years ago in Winnipeg we had a panel discussion. We had some one there from advertising; we had a housewife; we had someone there from the CBC on the panel, and we tried to pin them down to assure us, as viewers, that we wouldn't have objectionable advertising and that sort of thing coming over the radio, and they said, "Well, it is in your hands; if you people don't like what you see you write to the advertiser and tell him." So, there you are.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has this method that was suggested been followed to your knowledge?

MRS. TURNER BONE: I think to some extent, yes, but I don't believe -- people are awfully lazy, you know, about taking up a pen and writing letters -- some of them are any way -- I don't think Canadian people use the "Do it yourself" as much as they should.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, this suggested corrective may not actually work?

MRS. TURNER BONE: It may not; I couldn't say whether it would or not. It would seem reasonable.

THE CHAIRMAN: It would seem reasonable, but we have been told so many times just that same thing.

MRS. TURNER BONE: Really?

THE CHAIRMAN: What we are interested in knowing is whether or not it has, in fact, been taken care of; whether, as you suggest, people are just lazy about writing.

MRS. TURNER BONE: I suppose you can turn it off, but of course that isn't very good either.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, that is not good.

MRS. TURNER BONE: Now, Mr. Chairman, could I go back to this package news, in No.3.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I was going to ask a question about that later on. You might as well deal with it right now.

MRS. TURNER BONE: I was told by people in the broadcasting business about this news. I was complaining about when you turn the radio on in the morning and you hear something about way down somewhere that really isn't up to us anyway, and they said, "Oh, well you know that is the fault of the news broadcaster." "They can buy this packaged news quite cheaply, and it saves them an awful lot of wear and tear on their brains," and also on the information that comes to them from Canada; it is -- I should not say Montreal experience, but my experience in listening to broadcasts that the private stations offend more than the CBC, but even the CBC at times give rather an overdose of what is happening in the United States, in my opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is not the question I wanted to ask you -- in the previous sentence you say "as presented by the C. B. C. and some privately owned stations and then, without qualification, you say "developed use by some stations of packaged news"?

MRS. TURNER BONE - Yes, that is not heavy.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was just trying to clarify. In the first place, do you apply the package news matter to the CBC at all?

MRS. TURNER BONE: No, they have their bureaus in the different cities.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you do say as far as the CBC is concerned, you say there is rather too much American news on it?

MRS. TURNER BONE: Sometimes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On the other hand, we have been told,and as a matter of fact we have been in some private stations throughout the country and they confirmed what we have been told, that some of these private stations have quite a substantial staff operating their news service and they have teletypes from the various news agencies so that those we have seen -- and we have heard about others -- actually try to give the news as it comes to them fashioned and they fashion it to the Canadian viewpoint as they see it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going on to that very question, Mr. Stewart, that you having disposed of the CBC not being involved in packaged news, you also know that many of the private stations do not offend, it is only some of them,

is it?

MRS. TURNER BONE: Yes, I think I am the guilty one who put that in because I find in my own listening here in Montreal -- it may not be general -- but certainly I think on a Sunday morning especially it sounds to me that they use that because they have time or there was not anything of interest to put on. But, to turn on the radio and get a whole string of murders and accidents outside of our own country, I do not think we are particularly keen on hearing that sort of news.

THE CHAIRMAN: But as far as the Council is concerned, you cannot give us any more specific information as to the number of stations or the proportion of stations that come in with this so-called packaged news?

MRS. TURNER BONE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: As compared with those who have their own news rooms, such as Mr. Stewart mentioned; you do not have any information on them?

MRS. TURNER BONE: No, but we could get it, I believe.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think we shall ask you to get it, I just wanted an idea of the prevalence of them.

MRS. TURNER BONE: I just found the people I mentioned it to were in agreement with me.

MR. COYNE: I suppose, Mrs. Turner Bone, what you are complaining about is the particular news which comes over the air which might either be a result of news being packaged for them, but it

might also be the result, I would suppose, of simply faulty editorial selection in the station newsroom?

MRS. TURNER BONE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: There must always be some selection of what news goes on the air?

MRS. TURNER BONE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Has there ever been a report by the Council of comparing newscasts to different stations to see if they are original or whether they ---

MRS. TURNER BONE: No, that would be an interesting.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know anything about it, I must say, unless they happened to turn to a couple of stations and they seemed to be very similar indeed, but that may be because they were reporting the same events.

MRS. TURNER BONE: That would make an interesting study, all right.

THE CHAIRMAN: In your recommendation No. 6, Mrs. Turner Bone, on page 4, you refer to the necessity for maintaining the quality of radio programmes as radio receivers are in twice as many Canadian homes as television sets. Does this ratio of two to one give any real indication of the degree to which radio is listened to; bearing this in mind, do you have any information or views as to whether in those homes which have both the radio and television if radio is listened to to any considerable extent?

MRS. TURNER BONE: No, I can only tell you that the housewife, when she is doing her work,

listens to the radio but she cannot sit and watch television, and the daytime listeners, as you know, are women. I think that what disturbed us was the fact that the advertisers found this television medium is a very good medium for their products, and possibly they may cut out their advertising programmes on the radio, which would make it much more expensive to run.

MR. COYNE: But really you are urging, then, if commercial revenues are reduced that the quality of radio programmes should be maintained?

MRS. TURNER BONE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: On the question of the funds that the CBC requires to maintain these services, has the Council any views as to how these funds should be provided or raised? For instance, there are several alternatives, partial alternatives in any event, that have been suggested from time to time, including such things as a licence fee on receiving sets.

MRS. TURNER BONE: No, they do not go into the finances at all; I do not think women care too much about that.

MR. COYNE: I was wondering, because as you point out, women spend eighty-five per cent of the consumer dollar.

MRS. TURNER BONE: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And there are a good many dollars that go into the CBC, and I thought perhaps your Council might have some interest.

MRS. TURNER BONE: No, I thought it was lovely when we did not buy the little licences, but

I think they have been fairly remiss in their thinking on that, leaving that to the male brains.

THE CHAIRMAN: Probably you have been negligent.

MRS. TURNER BONE: Maybe we have.

MR. COYNE: I have completed my questions, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have asked my questions as we went along; thank you very much for presenting this brief.

MRS. TURNER BONE: May I ask one question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. TURNER BONE: On school broadcasts, we understand that each province can put on their own school broadcasts, but the national broadcasts that go out across the whole country are put on by the CBC, and emanate chiefly from Ontario. They are good; I have listened to them, but it seems to me in a country as wide and as varied as it is that it should not be confined to Toronto. I have been told from time to time they selected another city to do some broadcastings on the national hookup, but regarding the peculiarity of the contribution that this province can make to the whole, I think that it would be very salutary if some of the provinces knew how we speak French, for instance, in this province, so the children could use the language in their daily lives. There have been some wonderful experiments in practice on that subject. I mention that particularly, and I would suggest that the CBC review their policy

of letting all the school broadcasts emanate from Ontario and give more variety to the ---

THE CHAIRMAN: We have to look into the question of school broadcasts to some extent. We have had a good deal of evidence about it, and I do not think our picture is complete at the moment at all. We have had evidence that the CBC attempts to handle the CBC broadcasts by putting their facilities, in effect, at the disposal of the provincial educational authorities for the, so to speak, regional or provincial sound broadcast type of thing. That depends, of course, on the willingness of the provincial authority to collaborate. We have had evidence in Alberta, Saskatchewan and I think British Columbia, and certainly some of the Maritime Provinces, and Ontario, where it is done, but apparently in this province it is not done, and when it is not done in this province by the responsibility authorities they are the ones who are to be charged with the education, it is their function, and if they do not want this particular form of education then that is their decision. Now, I believe there is one broadcast a week on a national hookup basis. We have not heard whether this is all Ontario, or mainly Ontario, or not; we will have to ask about that. As far as originating programmes in this province for national distribution, if you cannot get the local programme then it might be a little difficult to get the national.

MRS. TURNER BONE: I think you have a good point there, and I have not thought of it in

that way. True enough, the broadcasts in the Protestant schools are the Ontario broadcasts, but as a listener, it seems to me, we could have greater variety.

THE CHAIRMAN: This may be, but I think we might as well make it clear that there are these constitutional problems. There is one thing everyone seems to have agreed on and that is that the CBC have tried to respect and maintain the position of the provinces in the field of education, and when you are getting school broadcasts you are getting education, and if they have not done that and a change is wanted, then you are going to the wrong place if you go to the CBC, you have to go to the educational authorities.

MRS.TURNER BONE: Thank you very much; that is a good answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure we have the full story on the school broadcasts yet, but at least that seems to be where it sits at the moment.

MRS. TURNER BONE: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we have is that of the Canadian Association of Consumers.

SUBMISSION OF
CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF CONSUMERS

Appearances:

Mrs. H. E. Vautelet, President

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: This brief is being presented by Mrs. H. E. Vautelet.

We will begin by first of all thanking you for coming and especially on a Saturday morning. I am sorry we did not reach you yesterday when we had promised to. Secondly, we will mark your brief as Exhibit 201.

EXHIBIT NO. 201: Brief of Canadian Association of Consumers.

THE CHAIRMAN: As far as our procedure goes, I think you have noticed what it is. On a brief such as this we would like to have it presented either by reading or discussion, and after that we have some questions. As your brief is fairly short perhaps you would like to read it.

MRS. VAUTELET: Thank you. May I first of all, Mr. Chairman, apologize for the fact that quite a number of the members of our National Executive who intended to be here could not be here. Husbands are great interferers in

the activities of women's organizations.

THE CHAIRMAN: As consumers, of course, they help.

MRS. VAUTELET: Yes, they do most of the consuming in the house.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission: The Canadian Association of Consumers is Canada's only national voice for consumers. Its authority to speak for a representative cross-section at least of Canada's consumer interests rests on its ten provincial branches, some seventy-five to eighty local branches, and on a general membership of some twenty-five thousand members.

We forgot to mention the three hundred or four hundred little groups which are also included in our membership.

As a consumer association, C.A.C. has both an indirect and a direct interest in the subject of broadcasting. As citizens, its members are vitally interested in the power over both adult and juvenile minds increasingly vested in radio and television, and in a wise use and control of such power. As consumers and buying agents for the home, they find broadcasting increasingly shaping the buying habits, hence to a degree, the economic pattern of those homes. Moreover television and radio sets represent a constantly increasing investment of consumer funds, and these sets merely represent a vehicle for the wares the consumer is really purchasing. Though they have little control of this intangible part of their purchase, consumers have

a heavily invested interest in getting the best possible value for their money from programmes on the air.

Radio and television possess immense potentialities for maturing or distorting our manner of thinking in all fields -- even those of our buying and spending habits. Such a power cannot be safely left uncontrolled or exposed to the single law of commercial and industrial profit requirements. The C.A.C. approves of a reasonable control of broadcasting in Canada, aimed at maintaining good taste and at protecting our children against damaging programmes, but we also feel that definite limitations to "Freedom on the Air" in advertising are equally needed to protect Canadian consumers against exploitation of the credulous or uninformed through exaggerated promotion claims, something-for-nothing lures or misleading or offensive advertising.

We recognize that broadcasting in Canada is already doing a good job of controlling undesirable programmes and even to some extent advertising. Yet we would like to see a definite code controlling the good taste, adherence to fact and ethics of promotional and advertising programmes permissible on the air, that would be available to Better Business Bureaux, Consumer Groups and interested women's groups and listeners generally.

The average listener who writes in and complains of a programme has no means of knowing whether that programme is under any kind of code.

THE CHAIRMAN: When you speak of a code, do you mean this code in effect a matter of

regulation or do you mean it should be the kind of code of observation that is generally applied by self-regulation?

MRS. VAUTELET: I would suggest, simply judging by what I guess from the feelings expressed in the letters to us, that there is a need for some kind of an outline by which listeners could know if advertising or other matters on the air go beyond the limits of the regulatory body. I do not know if that is possible; it is simply a suggestion given to you by women who have no experience in the regulatory aspects of radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is obvious that any regulation or code, for instance, that attempts to define such matters as good taste and ethics, it is going to be very difficult to frame, and certainly if you move over into the field of formal regulation and say that you must do so-and-so, it becomes even more difficult because then you are in an area where if you make a regulation you have to enforce it. I just wanted to get as fully as possible the suggestion that lay behind this and the purpose of it. If there is any deeper ---

MRS. VAUTELET: The only thing I can suggest is, people have no means of knowing if something that offends them has been slipped through or is a regular thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the people who are doing the regulating have no means of knowing if something is offending people.

MRS. VAUTELET: The answer that was made

to me in a meeting was that they would see something on television -- it was on a private station -- and it was rather indecent costumes and implications of some kind on a scene. Now, is this allowed in Canada or is it just slipping through? I think if there was perhaps some kind written outline advocating the outer limit of what is not allowed for home and school groups and other groups like that, there would be something to refer to. There needs to be a generous and broad guide, the limits outside which advertising cannot go in Canada. It would help citizens and also the broadcasts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you concerned, apart from matters of indecency and so forth, good taste in that sense -- are you concerned also as consumers with what you might call the honesty of claims for goods, the question of whether a patent medicine will cure all the ills of the human body?

MRS. VAUTELET: Very deeply concerned. Actually, I shall cite a case because that question was put to me once about indecency, but knowing the minds of our consumers, they are even more concerned over some of the claims given over television and radio and their incapacity to know if these things are made legitimately or outside the regulations of the CBC.

Much of today's advertising on the air defeats its own objectives through irritation of the consumer it seeks to win. Moreover a reasonable restraint of the "Freedom to create consumer greeds" via so all-pervasive a medium as broadcasting seems increasingly necessary. Bending every effort of advertising to promote synthetic appetites in buying may become economically dangerous to even those who profit from such efforts. With Canada outdistancing the United States this year in credit and instalment buying, or in other words in consumer debtedness, we may be at the point in our economic development where some brakes set on the use of cajolery and promise to over-stimulate buying may be a safety measure for all -- not only consumers.

On this point we would like to especially protest advertising's increasing exploitation on the air of children's appetites for toys and premiums, as a means of forcing certain products on their parents. This aspect of the coupon and premium sales promotion practice is strongly condemned by our membership.

I could say here, overwhelmingly condemned. There has never been a dissenting voice in the volume of condemnation coming in.

Using children's special vulnerability as a merchandising weapon against the greater sales-resistance of their elders is a form of exploitation of the consumer that is questionable and increasingly unpopular. We realize that the remedy to this form of promotion does not lie within the fields of reference of this Commission, but we wish to use this

opportunity to register our condemnation of the practice.

Our dual Canadian method of public and private enterprise systems of broadcasting, operating in competition, has proved its value, even while creating certain problems. Competition is, in an accepted, competitive economy, both a protection for the consumer and a guarantee of the quality of goods and services offered. We believe that consumers derive a like protection and quality of programmes from the reasonable amount of freedom of competition on the air under an equally reasonable amount of control such as is assured by our present system.

All our C.A.C. branches and members presenting their views unanimously endorse the values of a publicly owned and financed system, such as the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and the need to keep it efficient and financially independent so it may continue to give us the type of service it now provides, we also recognize however the problems of private broadcasting systems in competition with a publicly financed corporation and feel that such a situation imposes on the government the need to carefully defend and protect the legitimate interests of privately owned broadcasting systems, if reasonably free competition is to be maintained, as it is to the interest of consumers that it shall be maintained.

We have received unanimous praise from our branches and members for the general run of the C.B.C. programmes and their importance as a unifying influence in our spread-out land. Our British Columbia branch

has especially stressed the value of some of these programmes in helping Canadians know each other. Such programmes, however, have been mainly cultural or of a human-interest nature. We would like to see more programmes showing the different, yet independent aspects of our Canadian economy, in a form the average consumer can easily assimilate.

Broadcasting is our most pervasive and powerful medium of adult education. It should be used to its utmost capacity in the furtherance of this education. Today's challenges to democracy makes a rapid education for all Canadians in the complex business of self-administration, a probable survival-requirement, and a far better and wider-spread knowledge of the economics of buying and selling may be of major importance in this business of learning to manage competently our personal share of our national affairs.

Programmes like the Farm Forum, the Citizens Forum, and Trans-Canada Matinee, to name only a few, are valuable contributions to this adult education via the air. There is a definite need, however, for something in the nature of a Consumer Forum, such as suggested by the brief by our Ontario Provincial Branch, already in the hands of the Commission, to reach and inform the buyers of Canada of the responsibilities they bear in relation to our economy.

The business of spending Canada's housekeeping dollars is to an important degree the business of steering Canada's internal economy, for how the consumers buy -- what the consumers buy -- and the

services more and more required to make them buy -- decide to a major degree what it will pay Canada most to produce and where it will pay Canada's man-power best to work. This power in consumers' hands needs greater guidance and information than it has yet received. There is a potential peril in leaving Canada's spending in untrained hands in a land whose economic stability is its strongest answer to the ways of life challenging it. We believe the generous assistance that the CBC and private broadcasting systems have always lent our association in its work of consumer education, proves their awareness of this fact. This awareness, however, needs a definite form, such as a cross-Canada programme, serving that universal person we call the consumer and serving as well as all other economic groups in Canada, since all groups are consumers, whatever their selling interests may be.

In reference to this Commission's study of ways and means of financing Canada's publicly-owned broadcasting system, we have neither received from our branches, nor feel qualified ourselves to offer any competent suggestions. We believe, however, that the strong endorsement of the value to the country of the CBC, received from our groups implies a readiness to accept the need to pay for such a system, through any way found fair and reasonable.

As an association we are, in principle, opposed to hidden or indirect taxation as a revenue-raising method, though recognizing that it is often inevitable. We feel that only through a visible

connection between costs and goods or services, can an ultimate consumer education in economic maturity be attained. We recognize that this attitude may not be opportune in the case of the CBC's financing, however, since a direct tax for such purposes might weigh too heavily on those consumers who most need but can least afford the services the CBC provides, and since some part of these informative and educational services could possibly be classed in the same category as the protective health services now provided for the general benefit out of the general purse. We would like to stress however that direct taxation helps create responsibility in the individual in the fields of public spending and that as we are about to suggest, if the public is entitled to a voice in the nature of the broadcasting wares he buys, it may also need the knowledge that it is buying and paying for such wares to enable it to use that voice wisely.

Whatever form public financial support of the CBC may take, we suggest that financing through taxation in one shape or another implies a certain public right to some means of influencing the commodity so financed, and that new methods through which public opinion can more directly reach and influence today's programmes need to be explored. Listener rating and opinions are not a sure or sufficient guide to the real needs of the public. Today, despite general public approval of the CBC's programmes and services there is a measure of uneasiness at some consequences of the average citizen's difficulty of access to its policy-forming board. On this point we would like

to endorse the feeling of many consumers that one representative woman at least is a necessity on the board of a corporation such as the CBC.

When these opinions came in it wasn't generally known Mrs. Houcke had been named to the Board, but at the same time this may be qualified by the fact that I reduced our request from more than one woman to one woman.

Women form a major part of broadcasting's listeners. They handle a major part of the buying of Canada -- they are the chief educators of the children whose minds are exposed and shaped by broadcasting. The lack of adequate women's representation on the CBC's Board seems to us a failure in realism.

While we are in complete accord with the principle that powerful mediums for forming people's thinking need to be controlled, so that freedom of the air does not become license, and though we feel that the CBC has done, by and large, a conscientious and competent job of applying such controls, we wonder if the present system does not work so as to hamper and reduce the efficiency of the CBC itself in exercising such controls?

Today, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is being exposed to a usually unwarranted, yet a growing body of criticism, through its anomalous position as the regulatory body of its own competition, a situation unusual in a democracy. This situation cannot but hamper the CBC's capacity to impose the sterner forms of control that may be necessary since it is aware

that its decisions may be suspect in the eyes of a part at least of the public. Without removing present controls over private and public broadcasting, might it not be desirable to explore ways of protecting our publicly-owned system from the dangers inherent in so unfavourable a position, and of freeing it from the growing censure that is directed more against the position the CBC has been forced into than at its uses of that position.

In ending, the Canadian Association of Consumers wishes to express its appreciation and warmly praises the clear vision of the value of the work and the constantly generous assistance that the CBC, especially its women's affairs section, has rendered our association in its difficult, pioneering work of consumer education and representation.

Our Saskatchewan provincial branch also wishes us to stress the debt all our provincial and local branches owe to Canada's private broadcasting stations, whose gifts of free time to our association have been constant and valuable, and in view of their competitive economic position extremely generous.

We hope that the findings of this commission will add strength and financial security to our present dual systems of broadcasting, and that the power of radio and television will continue to be increasingly used as a means of furthering our urgent education in responsible and competent citizenship, in which the economic knowledge and competence of the consumers of Canada forms a vital part.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Vautelet, we want to thank you for this brief not only because of its content, but I must say, speaking for myself, that at times our study seems to get down to a debate between private broadcasters on the one hand and public broadcasters on the other, and therefore it is very good to have a representation to us from a body representing the people of Canada as you do. We will have somequestions; I have a few, and Mr. Coyne may care to start off.

MR. COYNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Vautelet, just reverting for a moment to the matter that you were discussing with the Chairman concerning advertising, at the top of page 2 in the paragraph which begins a few lines from the top.

MRS. VAUTELET: "On this point we would like to protest..."?

MR. COYNE: Yes, where the play is made upon the children's taste and they are urged to influence their parents: dealing with that sort of problem, have you any specific suggestions as to how that sort of thing should be controlled or regulated or prohibited?

MRS. VAUTELET: There is no means that we can see, beyond our continual protests which we hope will wear down this attitude as far as selling premiums for children in stores is concerned. But our members are concerned particularly with the appeal to the children over the air. You can refrain from taking your child to the supermarket and exposing him to the temptation, but it is extremely difficult to keep your child away from the radio or television,

and keep them from being exposed to the temptations over the air. Also the other field we have been fighting for a long time, the field of that form of advertising and selling goods, which does not come into your field at all except through advertising, but I know the mothers in our membership -- they are mostly mothers -- have been or are in the process of becoming mothers -- object, that if they want their children to listen to a programme that interests them, half the time that child will be lured into demanding "Supermunch" for breakfast for six or seven weeks even if the rest of the family doesn't like it and even though he does not eat it himself, in order that he can get something or other.

MR. COYNE: I suppose there are ways of dealing with it. I suppose some regulatory body could lay down a detailed schedule of regulations respecting advertising, including prohibitions and that sort of thing, or perhaps, in the alternative, there could be some form of body that, in effect, operated as a police force, and if something was done by an advertiser which offended in this way, they could then say, "You will not do it again because it is an offence under our regulations". I am just wondering whether your association has developed this protest in their own minds to the extent of thinking in terms of specific methods by which these matters could be dealt with.

MRS. VAUTELET: Mr. Chairman, you realize that circularizing an association of 25,000 members through Canada is so difficult, particularly in the

summer, and questions like this must be answered on my own cognizance to a great degree. I cannot speak in the name of the association. I am perhaps reasonably equipped to answer, because I have just completed my third cross-Canada trip and have interviewed thousands of consumers.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will not hold the association responsible for what you say, but anything you say that will help us will be appreciated.

MRS. VAUTELET: The assocation will be greatly relieved to hear that. I would say what the consumers, who are all agitated -- this is a universal thing -- would like to see would be some regulation which would protect children at least. They can see what we have been trying to teach them, but consumers must to a great degree protect themselves -- adult consumers, that is. We cannot wrap ourselves in regulations which would protect the people against the need to use their own judgment and their own minds. They feel children come in another category. It is practically impossible to protect a child against a "come-on", a promotional scheme appeal, which appeals to their special vulnerability, and feels in a democracy we should side-step regulations whenever we can, the protection of our children in every form comes into another category.

MR. COYNE: This may be a field in which some specific...

MRS. VAUTELET: Action.

MR. COYNE: ... regulatory action would be justified?

MRS. VAUTELET: I think it would be approved by our members.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave that point, at the end of that same paragraph you, in a sense, say you are putting the protest in even though you know it is outside our terms of reference. In a strict sense that may be true, but in an indirect way it may come within our terms of reference. We are asked to look at the whole question of performance by both public radio and television, and we have had various arguments on this whole subject of controls and regulations, the reason for regulations, and so forth and one of the points that has been put to us several times this week has been this argument: that you don't need to worry about regulations; leave it to the public; they will deal with it, and for the purposes of bringing out that point I raised with some of these witnesses some question as to whether or not the public could effectively deal with it -- that is, deal with it except in the very ultimate sense of refusal, for example, to buy or to turn the set off, or something as extreme as that. Tell me if this is a fair inference, but I take it throughout your memorandum and in what you have said to us, speaking on behalf of this large body of consumers, you feel some regulation of programme content and performance is necessary and that you cannot rely -- or, I put it more directly: can you rely, as some witnesses have suggested, on the pressure of public opinion?

MRS. VAUTELET: I think we have stated here that we do believe regulations and controls are necessary. That is a statement backed up by the answers I have received to our questionnaire in preparing this brief. I think in a case like our organization we can rely to a point on public action, because organizations like ours are grouped and have means of communication with each other and means of expressing their opinions. As a matter of fact, we have quite often had to control use of those means because an uninformed group of consumers can be blackmailed. But, at the same time, we represent 25,000-odd of the public of Canada -- a very small cross section of the public. We receive, however, opinions from a much wider area, and these opinions coming in have no means of expression beyond the one that democracy is becoming too lazy to use -- direct personal action whenever you are offended. A busy housewife has not yet been equipped with the audacity in many cases to sit down and write her opinion, even if she wants to express it; she will express her opinion to another woman, but not to the powers that be, and mostly she won't know where to express it. There has been no information ever given that I know of over the air by CBC, as the regulatory body, as to where protests against general principles in broadcasts could be sent in.

THE CHAIRMAN: Even with your 25,000 members of the association which you represent, take this specific matter of excessive premiums offered to children: I would think that if there ever were

a specific thing, that would be an example. I am trying to test this submission that has been put to us as to the effectiveness of public opinion to get the kind of broadcasting the public wants. In this case I take it that even with your 25,000 people you don't feel you can cope with it by asserting your preferences, but you need regulations?

MRS. VAUTELET: I think we could cope with it given 10 years to build up strength, and we are sending in protests from every one of our annual meetings. We are going to send them up again when the resolutions come in for the next annual meeting about two weeks from now. These protests go, however to the advertising association, for example -- the Canadian Advertising Association, or to the retail merchants and different groups who are paying for these broadcasts. So far they have never been sent to the CBC as a regulatory body. Perhaps we should start on that, and if we did I think we could guarantee action in 10 years. That is about the time we find it takes -- 5 or 10 years to get a major change in some of the regulations we have been fighting. Meanwhile some of our members are suggesting the children who are suffering from this would have been cured by the passage of time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Presumably the interest of your particular members will have evaporated by that time.

MRS. VAUTELET: New ones will have started.

MR. COYNE: If I may pursue this from a slightly different angle, and it arises from your next paragraph where you speak of competition, and you point out competition is, in an accepted, competitive economy, both a protection for the consumer and a guarantee of the quality of goods and services offered, what I would like to ask you is whether in a field such as broadcasting, competition is likely to have the same effect as it unquestionably has in a field say of goods and services?

MRS. VAUTELET: Could I answer this again individually?

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh yes.

MRS. VAUTELET: As the president -- as myself, rather. I think it can. The experience even before our association's birth -- we are only 10 years old, and we have to look back over what happened -- we have been called in many times to a fight on an issue of how much protection an industry or a section of an industry should be entitled to, and we think there is an overwhelming evidence, human nature being what it is, that the moment you have no need to fear competition you go to sleep at the switch, so to speak.

MR. COYNE: Let me put this to you: if you assumed, for example, that the sole function of broadcasting was to entertain, and you had two or three stations each seeking to provide that entertainment, and then possibly the competitive reaction between them would ensure that each one was striving to

provide the best and most popular entertainment -- in other words, they are all doing the same thing and the competition will perhaps ensure that they each strive to do the best to provide the entertainment ...

MRS. VAUTELET: Exactly.

MR. COYNE: ... supposing the question is a little more diverse, and it is a question of whether they should provide entertainment or education, how will competition ensure that they will perform that educative function which will not appeal to a popular, let us presume, to a popular mass audience?

MRS. VAUTELET: Aren't you taking for granted the education would not appeal to a reasonably large audience?

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MRS. VAUTELET: I think it would, where members of an organization like ours are concerned -- or where mothers are concerned.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but you can draw a broad distinction between the type of obviously popular programme -- a football game or a variety show on the one hand, and a forum discussion, such as you suggest somewhere in this, on the other, which necessarily is going to have more of a minority appeal.

MRS. VAUTELET: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And I think Mr. Coyne's question is, how do competitive forces, and particularly

competition between the public and private systems, if there are two lines of approach, how does competition improve the quality of the minority type programme or even the presence of it?

MRS. VAUTELET: I would say Mr. Chairman that if you have only one station to turn to and no alternative choice -- human nature itself would slowly lower the pressure on that one station to listen to what the public may wish to have whereas if you have two in competition or more than two competitive stations, since I gather that they live in great part by the advertising they get and the advertising is based upon the listeners, --

MR. COYNE: The number of listeners.

MRS. VAUTELET: The number of listeners -- that they think they can show, and their capacity of giving extra service that would appeal to the minority and things such as educational programmes depend upon how much money they can make on the popular entertainment, the restriction of choice of the consumer by just having one station would render the consumer almost helpless to ensure that he gets the best quality or the top rank quality of programmes because he has to take it or leave it. We get quite a lot of complaints about certain sections of the country where only one station comes in and the complaints are almost always as to the calibre or the quality of what comes in. They might not get a better quality from the competing station, but they would feel that they are to obtain it if they wanted to take action.

THE CHAIRMAN: What we are really aiming at Mrs. Vautelet is your statement in this paragraph "Competition is in an accepted competitive economy, both a protection for the consumer and a guarantee of the quality of goods and services offered. We believe that consumers derive a like protection and quality programmes from the reasonable amount of freedom of competition on the air under an equally reasonable amount of control such as is assured by our present system." You are applying this I understand to broadcasting.

MRS. VAUTELET: We do believe that the consumer derives a like -- maybe not as strong but -- a similar protection from having a choice of programming.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh no, my question was as to whether or not this principle of completition with which we all generally agree as far as quality of goods offered for sale is concerned -- if it does in fact apply in the communication field for instance, in relation to the horror comics -- you won't necessarily get better comics but you may get them more horrible.

MRS. VAUTELET: Oh it isn't really necessary but we have one of our past provincial presidents who has been to England in the last two years and she just came back as a matter of fact she has had two trips -- and she is shocked with the quality of some of the programmes -- not horror programmes but what you would call the boring quality of some of the programmes which the BBC sends out -- and there is no alternative in England.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well if she has been in the last two years she may be reporting on what used to be or on what is happening now since they have competition in broadcasting.

MRS. VAUTELET: Oh have they got competition there now -- I didn't know. As a matter of fact this was last Spring.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this TV?

MRS. VAUTELET: Oh no no, this was radio, not TV. She said she was relieved to get to a country where, if you didn't like the type of programme you didn't have to make a march on London or something of that kind which they seem to think is the only way they will get any support because of the BBC; but it seems to me Mr. Chairman, that through the psychology of the thing, the fact that you can lose listener rating if you are not trying to jack up your programme and keep on your toes to see what you can offer and give the consumers, it is a sort of guarantee of effort to improve programmes continually.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if you were only trying to jack up your listener rating you would never carry an opera.

MRS. VAUTELET: Well this would probably affect the minority of the country as such -- the minority that is serious thinking. As a matter of fact I was in a meeting at Regina about two years ago when we discussed the value of serious programmes and the feeling was that the public wanted alternate choices or an alternate choice on different stations

and in that way you would get better amusement and I think the feeling is that we would benefit if there were alternate choices that one could turn to.

MR. COYNE: This is in the amusement field Mrs. Vautelet?

MRS. VAUTELET: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Oh yes, and then in the next sentence you say we believe that consumers derive a like protection and quality of programmes from the reasonable amount of freedom of competition on the air under an equally reasonable amount of control such as is assured by our present system. Now is it fair to infer that your association does not believe in absolute competition -- you are thinking or expressing here in general terms the approval of the adoption of a compromise, if you like, that we now work under.

MRS. VAUTELET: Exactly.

MR. COYNE: Now if I might turn to the question of financing of the CBC, I note that you say you don't feel qualified to offer particular suggestions.

MRS. VAUTELET: May I say here that we asked for suggestions in a memorandum sent out to our provincial branches and our executives but got none.

MR. COYNE: And you go on to stress in general terms your views as to the authorizing of direct taxation in making the taxpayers realize what they are paying for what services. Have you any specific suggestions in mind as to how this could be applied in the financing of public broadcasting

and of course, the matter that comes immediately to mind is whether or not some type of license fee which is a direct tax on listeners,to the extent that the listener listens to a programme supported by the license fee -- if that is the type of thing you have in mind.

MRS. VAUTELET : Here I must speak for my association. The majority dislike intensely the licensing system. In other words, they were just thinking of their convenience. They were not trying to think of the answer to the problem - they just wanted the CBC for their convenience. Therefore, it is rather hard to give an answer to a question of this sort,but I think if we polled our association at the present moment they would almost all of them be against licensing at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN : And I suppose if you also polled them on the question of the virtues of a direct tax they would probably say that that was a good idea.

MRS. VAUTELET : Well it is very hard to answer a question like this. We are not suggesting anything -- they were very neutral, but we have to re-affirm our position, that we feel that consumer responsibility - which after all is the business that we are engaged in, and we have told this to industry and trade many times - requires comparison between the service you are getting and the cost of that service. Therefore as a basic principle we have always been in favour of a visible

indication of that sort - and we have stated that we feel this may not apply to the CBC. My own personal idea would be something in the nature of a tax like the old age pension tax or your income tax, or something of that sort, that would make the consumer aware of what they were putting into the kitty to get themselves a service like this. But that is purely personal. We are not in favour of anything that is going to inconvenience us.

THE CHAIRMAN : Are you suggesting in fact that wherever the funds come from, it should be possible for them to be identified, so that the person paying the tax would realize where the funds go?

MRS. VAUTELET: I am not suggesting that on behalf of the association; that is my personal thought.

MR. COYNE : Yes,we appreciate that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well what that amounts to Mrs. Vautelet, is that it would come out of the general funds, too?

MRS. VAUTELET: Visibly, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN : Then what you are suggesting is an ear-mark tax?

MRS. VAUTELET : Yes, I am not suggesting it in the name of the association of course, because there is such a big difference of opinion and it was left quite free.

THE CHAIRMAN : That is certainly a consideration.

MR.COYNE: Turning to your final paragraph on page 4 Mrs.Vautelet, you are really dealing

with the question of whether the CBC itself is a proper regulatory body and you raise the question as to whether it would be desirable to explore --

MRS. VAUTELET: Ways of protecting our publicly-owned system from the dangers inherent in so unfavourable a position, and of freeing it from the growing censure that is directed more against the position the CBC has been forced into than its uses of that position.

MR. COYNE: That is it, yes. Now what I am asking is this and it is a general question really which has to do with the independent regulatory body of which we have heard a very great deal, and you infer here that something of that nature might be a good thing for the system.

MRS. VAUTELET: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Is it purely because of this psychological situation that the CBC gets into which you have referred to here that leads you to believe this, or is there anything specifically of value, in the view of the association, in the type of structure you suggest.

MRS. VAUTELET: We were in a very difficult position in preparing this brief in that our members are citizens who have broad and varied views on the subject, some of them quite stormy as are my own, but we feel we are justified in presenting the angle of those views that concern consumer-interests directly.

The quality and the control over the quality of programmes on the air is of consumer interest and therefore, we simply put this remark in here, dealing

with purely the reaction on the possible efficiency of controls on these programmes which the present sitatuion might create. Our individual members have, in many cases, much more explosive points of view on the matter -- I have myself -- but this is a consumer association presentation and we felt that it should not step outside the consumer interest.

THE CHAIRMAN: Really what you are saying then is, that if some change such as this should lead to an improvement of the quality of programmes then it should be seriously considered.

MRS. VAUTELET: Yes. If they should lead to long range better guarantees than now exist as to complete competence in controlling programmes, then our association feels and, it is implied here I think fairly directly, a situation in which the controlling body must run the gauntlet of public opinion in its decisions tends to influence those decisions to a certain point and we are trying to deal here, less with specific cases, than with basic principles effecting the function of a regulatory body.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then you really are suggesting that possibly that the independent body would be a much more effective and strengthening regulator and controller of radio than the CBC, because of the difficulties in which the CBC finds itself.

MRS. VAUTELET: No, not only more effective -- we have had no criticism from our members as to the efficiency, at least when we were asking for their opinion for this brief, the efficiency of the controls,

but the situation does add an added strain on the controlling body, which doesn't seem to us to give the consumer the full benefits of impartiality.

In this case the suggestion is that -- and I know of one particular case, but I couldn't mention it here --- although it does happen, to a degree, that there have been cases where private stations have been allowed to get away with what they would never have been allowed to get away with, if it had not been for the strong amount of public opinion in the newspapers of that province at the moment.

This seems to be a possibility that can arise at any time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Fundamentally, it is what Mr. Coyne says, is it not? There may be a little timidity or softness or lack of full, vigorous enforcement because of this debate that is going on about the position of the CBC?

MRS. VAUTELET: Exactly; I think the CBC is in a position where it is being exposed by we the people to strains.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the alternative would be that an independent regulation would be better regulation, would not be subject to these softnesses?

MRS. VAUTELET: The full distance we failed to go in this brief; we say:

> "Without removing present controls over private and public broadcasting, might it not be desirable to explore ways of protecting our publicly owned system from the dangers inherent in so unfavourable a position, and of freeing it from the growing censure that is directed more against the position the CBC has been forced into than at its uses of that position."

That is as far as we go in our brief. I feel that a situation that in principle would offend in private enterprise or in other fields, like the railroads and so on, could not be considered a sound principle, and however carefully an Association may have carried out the heavy duties

laid upon its shoulders, that those duties are founded on an unsound principle, and there will always be the possibility of trouble ahead.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Could I carry on from there on this same subject? In the paragraph previous to the one Mr. Coyne referred to, you say:

> "We wonder if the present system does not work so as to hamper and reduce the efficiency of the CBC itself in exercising such controls."

Do I get the meaning of that directly in that you feel the CBC is a broadcasting company and that is its function, and the fact that they have the regulating controls imposed upon them could detract from their efficiency as a broadcaster?

MRS. VAUTELET: No, the meaning was, as a regulating company or organism it will be engaged in administering the controls with the suspicions that are directed at them.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You do not feel though that it might also detract from the programming because they are using the brains for that purpose that could be better used in the function as a broadcasting company?

MRS. VAUTELET: Personally -- and this will have to be a personal answer -- I do not think so, because it would seem to me that financed by the people of Canada the CBC would be able to hire enough brains to carry on the two functions. The major point that impressed me in this situation is

that we are violating a basic principle in that it is not accepted in a generally free economy; it may be accepted in Russia or other places, but those who are interested in competing and wanting audiences for customers, as they would be in a trade or industry like this, away from any competitor, should really have the power of regulation over that competitor. This again is strictly personal, an individual point of view in the matter. Here the analogy would seem to me to be, what would happen to the public opinion if the C.P.R. was put totally under the rule of the C.N.R. without any power of appeal to anyone, and the C.N.R. were making the decisions as to removal of lines and granting of lines?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You would not feel, though, that because of the rather extraordinary functions of the CBC, by reason of the Act in which they have got to provide a national broadcasting service, that they are in a somewhat different position vis a vis the private broadcasters, as the C.P.R. is to the C.N.R. You see, the railways have a different function entirely, and as I say, the CBC are required by law to give a national service. Now, if they put it to us that by reason of having to give a national service, they have the responsibility, and that responsibility or say a certain amount of authority, it would help us greatly if you would care to express an opinion on that point.

MRS. VAUTELET: I am very much bored, Mr. Stewart, at the present moment, because many

opinions are very definite on the matter, and I have no reason to believe my opinions are shared by the members of our membership, who may not have thought about such matters. Generally speaking, it cannot be the opinion of our membership, and we would have no right to express opinions in a field that does not directly bear on us.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: We would value your personal opinion.

MRS. VAUTELET: My personal opinion would be that we can trust no group of human beings to remain detached and dispassionate from the interests of the association they themselves conduct, so as to have guarantees of fair dealings forever with their competitors. It does not seem within the possibility of human nature.

THE CHAIRMAN: The point we have raised to various people, trying to get our minds around this problem, is this kind of thinking -- that if it is wrong in principle you would expect the wrongness to show up sooner or later; otherwise you may be wrong in thinking it is wrong in principle, and after twenty-five years of this system I raised the question. Would you not think that somewhere somebody would be able to point to a situation of concrete unfairness, something that was a conflict of interest and duty?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think we have had in the last two days three different concrete cases all of which had gone back quite a number of years, but the point that Mrs. Vautelet has made ---

MRS. VAUTELET: Human nature is human nature.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Human nature is human nature.

MRS. VAUTELET: Could I say here that I did not take any steps to provide myself with examples of this sort. First of all, coming here, I did not come here as a special pleader on this side. I know of three cases which have been brought to my attention, for which, if I had thought it would be brought up, I would have got the data. However, in a court of law a witness who says that he remembers some details and has forgotten others, that he has been told something which was not verified, would not be allowed to present his testimony as being authentic. Therefore, although I have been the recipient of quite a few complaints in different places in Canada -- one in Vancouver, one in Toronto and one in Montreal -- all cases cited to me, I never verified them or brought them to the condition where I would dare at the moment to verify them, even though in one case I suffered from them.

I think the basic principle can be entertained, whether or not this has led to poor consequences.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not suggesting that it cannot; I am just raising with you the question as to whether one of the tests of the principle is how it works.

MRS. VAUTELET: Speaking as an individual and not as the president of C.A.C., there was a few

years ago a very popular programme from the United States that came in on Saturday. I do not remember the private station, but it was a big money maker. There may have been a lot of justification and reasons that I have never explored, but one day that programme disappeared from the air in Montreal. The newspapers were full of protests because it was a very popular programme, and the CBC explained that it had had two sponsors and it was against the regulations of the CBC to accept a programme with two sponsors. Apparently the protests went on because the programme reappeared on another evening on the CBC network. I know nothing about it; I am giving it to you as an individual. There may have been very strong justification. We in our organization are rather sympathetic towards the CBC, and there may have been a very good reason, but the public at that time were not seeing them, if there were any. I am just giving you this as an individual because I have had personal contact with it. I have had other cases reported to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: That would amount to the CBC using its power of regulation to obtain a programme from its competitor?

MRS. VAUTELET: I would say it did not do it with that intention, and there may have been a lot of reasons behind this, they simply followed the regulations, and under the pressure of public opinion they decided to give it back to the public but made the slight mistake of giving it back to their own network. I cannot even give you the year,

and as far as the newspapers are concerned I would not like this to appear because I am a lawyer's daughter and I do not believe in presenting in court evidence which is inadequate and on which the other side has not given their point of view.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, this is not a court of law and is not bound by the rules of evidence, but it is perhaps a little unwise for us to get into an example that there is no possibility of tracing down.

MRS. VAUTELET: If I had come here speaking as a citizen I would have taken the trouble to trace back to the people who brought it to my attention, or I might have got a letter from the people in the CBC itself.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Going back to the matter of advertising, I do not know that this point has ever come up before where we have been sitting, but I have certainly heard it on a sufficient number of occasions, and I would like to get your views on it. It has been put to me either in these hearings or otherwise that when a product is advertised a good many feel that the station or the network over which the advertisement goes actually recommends that product. Now, within your Association you have probably all levels of intelligence and mentality and economic groups, and I wonder if you would care to tell us whether actually that would be the case, that there are those people who feel that the product advertised is actually being recommended by the station over which they hear that advertisement?

MRS. VAUTELET: We have two categories of members in our Association; the majority are grouped in branches but there is a scattered membership of probably six thousand or seven thousand who are simply members sitting in on membership, and we only reach them through our bulletin. The majority of the members within our branches generally would not believe that a product is being sponsored by a station. They have, depending on how recently the branches were formed -- between two and ten years of consumer education, which we are carrying on as intensely as we can. I could not answer for the members at large who represent such a variety as that of the Canadian nation would represent, and they may very possibly believe the station sponsors them.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You think it is a possibility?

MRS. VAUTELET: Yes, but I would say the individual consumer who represents the majority of our members, there would be very little danger of them ever believing that.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: As a matter of curiosity, in this brief there is a reference somewhere to something like a consumer forum. Could I ask what is your conception of a consumer forum; do you have in mind anything as specific as the kind of advice given to its readers by the magazine of the Consumers' Union, which is a magazine published in the United States, which you no doubt know about, or something much broader or academic like discussions on buying things at a special

time of the year, and prices, and that sort of thing?

MRS. VAUTELET: What I have in mind is very much what you get on the Farm Forum, which is a series of discussions on subjects of concern to the class being dealt with, or to the economic interests being dealt with. It is a pet baby of mine and I am going to speak freely about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Arising out of this, would there not be danger,if you did have a consumers' forum,it would inevitably gravitate towards this other kind of discussion of quality and preference?

MRS. VAUTELET: I do not think so. Before you could discuss quality and preference you have to have some pretty strong testing laboratory behind it.

THE CHAIRMAN: This Association does.

MRS. VAUTELET: As far as that goes, we are not at all sure of advice from the States that their laboratory equipment is up to the information they give. But, that does not concern us, but it is the reason why we have refused in our Association, without the means to do it, to enter into the field. Occasionally we do have some products tested. The consumer forum I realize, and on which I have already gone to the CBC to consider and think about, rests upon much broader grounds than this. When we entered on the field a bunch of frightened housewives who had never been in the economic field, we discovered a danger of blindness on the part of the whole society. Women do over 85 per cent of the domestic buying,

therefore they are the pilots of the economy of the country, and to a great degree what they buy decides where their husband is going to work and what he is going to make. They seem to have no idea of the powers they hold as to the power of the buying dollar, and no idea that they are indeed the pilots in the economic life. The consumer forum would seem even more necessary to me than the Farm Forum because farmers are a section of the community, whereas consumers are the whole of Canada; it is in the overall interest of Canada, and we speak for the entire nation. There are an enormous number of consumers who are blindly ignorant, they have not the slightest idea of what happens when they buy an imported sheet because they like the word "imported" on it, but they may be closing a mill in the Maritimes by so doing. They have no idea the difference between buying margarine instead of butter, what the consequence may be to the farmer. The area of consumers has been left so wide, I have been wondering for ten years what a society could do with these pilots of the boat blindly ignorant of the boat, and why they should use it wisely. We are reaching through our branches as many members as we can, but with our limited funds we cannot reach every area in Canada. I personally do not see how we can feel that a citizens' forum or a farm forum can be of greater importance than a forum in which all the different aspects of buying and the spending of our consumer dollar, all the things

that housewives cannot go to school to learn and are not taught, but can get on the radio.

I made a speech; I am sorry.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mrs. Vautelet, you can see we have enjoyed having you here and we appreciate your coming. I think perhaps we will rise now for five minutes.

---Short recess.

(French follows)

Montréal, 15 septembre 1956

Mémoire présenté par

L'ASSOCIATION PROFESSIONNELLE DES INDUSTRIELS

---

Ont comparu

M. Claude Lavery M. Wilfrid Girouard

M. Henri Dagneault M. Aimé Laplante

---

THE CHAIRMAN: The next and final brief here in Montreal is that of the Association Professionnelle des Industriels to be presented by Colonel Baribeau. Would you introduce the others who were able to come, and we want to tell you how much we appreciate you coming on Saturday morning.

M. CLAUDE LAVERY: Monsieur Baribeau n'a pu se rendre et je le remplace à titre de secrétaire. Il me fait plaisir de présenter M. Wilfrid Girouard, actuellement vice-président de l'Association; M. Georges Dagneault, qui a préparé le mémoire, et M. Aimé Laplante, membre du comité exécutif de l'Association.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you begin I would like to mark your brief as Exhibit 202.

EXHIBIT NO. 202 : Submission by L'Association Professionnelle des Industriels.

You know our procedure that it can be

presented in either French or English. If you are reading you can read as fast as you like, but if you are speaking in French to Mr. Stewart and me, you had better not speak too rapidly.

M. LAVERY : Monsieur le président, messieurs les commissaires, L'Association professionnelle des Industriels, fondée en 1943, groupe environ 600 firmes, industrielles et commerciales, réparties en neuf sections régionales dans la province de Québec. Mieux connue sous les initiales d'A.P.I., elle a pour but la formation des patrons aux responsabilités et aux devoirs de leur fonction sociale et la défense de leurs intérêts généraux.

Réunissant ainsi des chefs d'entreprise qui sont auditeurs de la radio et spectateurs de la télévision et qui, en plus, sont susceptibles de commanditer des programmes, l'A.P.I. s'intéresse naturellement à ce qui touche ces deux grands moyens de communication modernes, la radio et la télévision. A ce titre, elle a donc l'honneur de soumettre le présent mémoire.

Elle félicite d'abord le gouvernement canadien d'avoir institué votre Commission non seulement pour répondre au voeu de la Commission Massey, mais aussi pour étudier à fond l'ensemble du problème de la radio et de la télévision.

L'A.P.I. croit, en effet, qu'il est

nécessaire de repenser toute la question. Le présent mémoire n'a d'autre but que d'apporter sa modeste contribution à l'effort commun en ce sens.

A cette fin, l'A.P.I. soumet humblement les recommandations suivantes:

1- La radio et la télévision, au Canada, sont exploités commercialement par le secteur étatisé et par le secteur libre: il faut non seulement maintenir cette formule, mais la développer.

2- Le développement de cette formule devra se faire en faisant à l'avenir une place de plus en plus large au secteur libre.

Pour justifier cette double recommandation, nous verrons d'abord:

a) l'évolution qu'a subie l'exploitation de la radio et de la télévision dans notre pays;

b) nous préciserons ensuite ce que nous entendons par la place de plus en plus large que le secteur libre doit occuper dans cette exploitation au Canada.

Evolution:1-l'exploitation commerciale de la radio a été le fait, en premier lieu, de l'entreprise privée, sur notre continent. 2- A cause de l'immensité de notre pays; de la complexité de ce domaine nouveau qu'était alors la radiodiffusion; et du rôle de suppléance de l'Etat; il était normal que l'Etat intervînt dans la radio. 3- Mais cette intervention aurait pu se limiter à un rôle a) de

contrôle en matière de longueurs d'ondes, d'équipement technique, etc. b) de surveillance au point de vue de la sécurité de l'Etat; c) de coordination des efforts des provinces et des postes privés; d) de suppléance vis-à-vis des lacunes à combler, des expériences à tenter et de la représentation de la radio canadienne sur le plan international.

4- En fait, l'intervention de l'Etat a été bien autre chose. Pour la décrire, il faut remonter à ses causes: il semble qu'on peut les résumer comme suit: a) la possibilité de voir les provinces établir leurs propres réseaux radiophoniques poussa l'Etat fédéral à s'emparer de ce domaine avant qu'il ne fût trop tard; b) l'invasion des programmes américains dans les secteurs de langue anglaise surtout pouvait sembler menaçante; c) l'absence de tout contrôle pouvait conduire à une anarchie dangereuse pour tous; d) à l'époque où fut fondée la première commission canadienne de la radio, la crise économique limitait les possibilités d'investissement des entreprises privées et favorisait au contraire les entreprises d'Etat.

5- Cette intervention, conçue comme une solution normale, permanente et essentielle, comportant cependant l'existence simultanée du secteur privé. Un projet de nationalisation de tous les postes privés fut rejeté. Par la suite, le Canada s'est toujours vanté de n'avoir pas choisi une formule uniquement étatiste, mais d'avoir au contraire utilisé la radio

d'Etat et la radio privée.

6- Toutefois, divers facteurs ont poussé Radio-Canada à devenir en fait un monopole, en dépit de l'existence du secteur privé.

7- Ensuite, il faut examiner comment cette intervention a été réalisée:

a) Radio-Canada n'a jamais recherché la collaboration des provinces qui ont pourtant des droits en matière de radiodiffusion et de télévision. Et même si l'on admet que Radio-Canada a pour but de desservir un auditoire envisagé comme un tout, d'un océan à l'autre, sans distinction de provinces, il reste que la société a pendant longtemps négligé de faire droit aux exigences de minorités qui étaient situées en dehors du Québec.

b) Par contre, dès le début, le gouvernement canadien et la société ont légitimement vanté le système d'exploitation de la radiodiffusion comportant l'existence simultanée d'un secteur étatisé et d'un secteur libre. C'est justement dans cela que résident l'originalité et la force de la formule canadienne de radiodiffusion.

c) En fait, cependant, sous diverses influences, la part du secteur libre a été réduite à la portion congrue par le secteur étatisé. Nous allons maintenant étudier ces influences:

1- La première influence ou le premier facteur a été la tendance socialiste du rapport Aird de 1929. Sans doute proposait-il la nationa-

lisation totale du secteur libre et sans doute ce projet a-t-il été mis de côté. Mais il n'en restait pas moins d'inspiration nettement socialisante.

2- Si cette inspiration était restée dans un document, le mal eût été moindre. Mais elle se concrétisât dans l'action de nombreux hauts fonctionnaires fédéraux de l'époque. D'ailleurs, à la suite de la crise économique, les interventions de l'Etat étaient en faveur un peu partout dans le monde.

3- Il n'y a aucun doute que la direction de Radio-Canada à un moment ou l'autre a subi plus ou moins l'influence de hauts fonctionnaires à tendance socialiste;

4- La guerre de 1939-1945 fut l'occasion d'un commencement d'évolution qui n'est pas encore terminée;

5- Au début, le conflit fournit l'occasion à Radio-Canada de resserrer son contrôle sur le secteur libre;

6- Simultanément, le conflit obligea Radio-Canada, pour fins de propagande, à étendre son rayonnement afin d'atteindre tous les groupes, y compris les minorités jusqu'alors oubliées;

7- Après la guerre, le secteur libre qui, comme la plupart des autres secteurs de produc-

tion et de la distribution, dans l'entre-deux-guerres, avait peu pratiqué l'organisation professionnelle, se groupa et put ainsi faire entendre sa voix.

8- Ses protestations portèrent sur deux points: d'Abord contre le monopole de Radio-Canada qui en fait un juge et un concurrent à la fois du secteur libre; contre le monopole qui lui réserve exclusivement le droit de former des réseaux de postes radiophoniques.

9- En effet, Radio-Canada, par ses règlements et sa surveillance, exerce une juridiction étendue sur le secteur libre de la radio et de la télévision. En même temps, la société exploite ses postes sur une base commerciale. Cette confusion de la qualité de juge et de partie dans la personne morale de la société a été maintes fois dénoncée. Il suffit donc de signaler le fait.

10- En outre, on le sait, Radio-Canada, par ses règlements, se réserve le droit exclusif de former des réseaux de postes radiophoniques et de télévision.

11- Toutefois, sur ces deux points, il y a eu évolution. a) d'abord, à la suite du rapport Massey, le gouvernement canadien a amendé la loi de la Société Radio-Canada afin de permettre aux postes du secteur libre d'en appeler à la Cour d'Echiquier de certaines décisions du bureau des gou-

verneurs de la société. b) ensuite, la société elle-même a modifié ses propres règlements, d'abord pour dire qu'elle accorderait, si on la lui demandait, la permission aux postes du secteur libre de se former en réseau; ensuite pour dire qu'elle accorderait à ces postes la faculté de réserver eux-mêmes leurs lignes de communication, sans passer par la société, une fois que celle-ci aurait permis la formation d'un réseau. c) tout ce qui précède vaut surtout et même exclusivement pour la radio. Or, il y a aussi la télévision. A son égard, Radio-Canada a adopté la même formule d'exploitation simultanée par le secteur étatisé et par le secteur libre. Toutefois, ses concessions au secteur libre sont encore trop faibles, trop peu nombreuses. Le refus de permettre aux postes de télévision du secteur privé de se former en réseau constitue encore une barrière. On prétend la justifier par l'impossibilité où se trouverait le marché canadien de faire vivre un réseau d'Etat et un réseau libre. Cette étude, croyons-nous, est à reprendre sur de nouvelles bases, car il semble que les chiffres de la Société Radio-Canada en matière de coût de revient ne soient pas suffisamment détaillés jusqu'ici pour asseoir définitivement un verdict aussi catégorique et d'une portée aussi considérable.

L'évolution de l'exploitation de la radio et de la télévision au Canada indique donc que la formule originale, comportant à la fois un secteur

étatisé et un secteur libre, après avoir été menacée a tout de même survécu et demeure la formule la plus vigoureuse et la plus saine, parce que le secteur libre y trouve une place de plus en plus large.

Qu'entendons-nous par la place de plus en plus large que le secteur libre doit désormais occuper dans l'exploitation de la radio et de la télévision? Pour répondre à cette question, nous formulerons d'abord un principe et ensuite quelques suggestions d'ordre général.

L'entreprise privée dans le secteur libre de la radio et de la télévision, à notre avis, doit être considérée comme une institution majeure et libre, égale à l'entreprise d'Etat et doit être entourée des conditions requises pour arriver à ce statut.

Ce principe découle de la formule selon laquelle l'exploitation de la radio et de la télévision doit être partagée entre le secteur étatisé et le secteur libre.

Si le Canada entend rester logique avec sa politique actuelle, il n'y a aucune raison pour que le secteur libre soit traité comme un mineur dont on a lieu de se méfier et dont on doit limiter l'activité.

Pour placer l'entreprise privée en

radiophonie et en télévision au niveau qui lui revient, il faut d'abord supprimer certaines des contraintes qui font encore obstacle à son épanouissement et il faut envisager son rôle dans une perspective nouvelle.

Quelles contraintes faut-il faire disparaître?

Radio-Canada semble décidée à maintenir une stricte séparation entre ce qui se passe dans la radio et ce qui se passe dans la télévision. Aussi, après avoir fait des concessions en matière de formation de réseaux à la radio, refuse-t-elle toute concession semblable en matière de télévision. Il faudrait examiner les motifs de cette distinction, son bien-fondé et voir s'il n'y a pas lieu d'étendre à la télévision la permission accordée à la radio. De toute façon, il faut certainement qu'un examen approfondi de ce problème précède toute concession pour respecter les exigences d'opportunité et de conditions. Cependant, il faudra tôt ou tard en arriver à permettre aux postes privés d'exploiter la radio et la télévision sur un pied d'égalité avec la radio d'Etat.

Il est bien évident que de telles études au sujet de la formation de réseaux et à d'autres sujets requièrent que les deux parties en présence soient sur un pied d'égalité et qu'un arbitre impartial prenne la décision finale. Dans l'état

actuel des choses, Radio-Canada est à la fois juge et partie et ne peut pas rendre un jugement digne de ce nom. Tôt ou tard, il faudra donc trouver une formule qui soustraie les postes privés à cette tutelle exercée par un concurrent.

Lorsqu'une entreprise d'Etat exerce une mission d'éducation dans les conditions où elle peut et doit le faire dans un pays comme le nôtre, il est inévitable qu'elle s'en acquitte en ne disant jamais rien contre les interventions de l'Etat. Au contraire, les interventions de l'Etat prennent figure de solutions normales, essentielles et permanentes. Non seulement peut-on différer d'opinion à ce sujet mais un pays comme le Canada ne peut pas se permettre le luxe de voir un organisme soutenu par les deniers des contribuables risquer de compromettre la vérité à ce point. Il y a donc là un abus qui équivaut à une contrainte qui s'exerce au détriment de l'entreprise privée.

Dans quelle perspective faut-il envisager la promotion du secteur libre à son nouveau rôle dans la radio et la télévision?

En prenant pour acquit que la décision finale sera impartiale et donc viendra d'en dehors de la Société Radio-Canada, il faut évidemment envisager cette promotion dans les cadres des exigences du bien général de la population canadienne. Celle-ci est chrétienne et se compose de deux grandes

races: les critères qui doivent exister et doivent s'appliquer indistinctement et également au secteur étatisé et au secteur libre devront donc s'inspirer de ces deux caractéristiques essentielles de la population à desservir, chrétienne et bilingue.

Toujours en supposant que les deux secteurs seront sur un pied d'égalité et non plus soumis l'un à l'autre, il faut prévoir que le secteur privé pourra former ses propres réseaux de postes de radio et de télévision, suivant des règlements impartiaux et rédigés après audition des parties;

Si, pour réaliser cette réforme, il faut imposer aux deux secteurs des responsabilités déterminées et précises en fait de programmes éducatifs et artistiques entièrement désintéressés, il n'y a aucune objection à cela, pas plus qu'il n'y aurait eu objection, au début de la radiodiffusion à ce que l'intervention de l'Etat se limite à un contingentement du nombre et du volume des programmes empruntés par la radio canadienne à la radio américaine.

Quels avantages peut-on espérer d'une telle réforme?

Radio-Canada, à force de penser à son auditoire d'envergure nationale, a perdu, petit à petit, contact avec l'auditeur individuel. D'ailleurs sa situation d'entreprise d'Etat, débarrassée

de tout souci du côté du prix de revient, dégagée de toute préoccupation vis-à-vis de la clientèle à maintenir, s'est fonctionnarisée, en dépit des efforts tentés pour faire croire que les artistes et les techniciens de la radio et de la télévision de l'Etat ne sont pas des fonctionnaires. Simultanément, en empêchant les postes privés de se former en réseaux, on les a limités à leur autitoire direct et immédiat. La décentralisation pratiquée par Radio-Canada ne peut pas être poussée assez loin pour coincider avec toutes et chacune des régions géographiques du pays. La formation de réseaux du secteur libre permettrait d'assouplir les lignes de communication radiophonique et de télévision et de combler le vide qui s'est créé peu à peu entre la hauteur où plane Radio-Canada et le cadre exigu où se débattent les postes privés.

La concurrence entre le secteur étatisé et le secteur libre constituerait une bonne chose, pour autant qu'une autorité impartiale établirait les normes morales et intellectuelles requises et applicables également aux deux parties;

En outre, la formation de réseaux libres permettrait de faire entendre des artistes ou des intellectuels empruntés à d'autres milieux qu'à ceux où Radio-Canada puise constamment et immanquablement. Peut-être même pourrait-on envisager que Radio-Canada faciliterait le dépistage de talents

nouveaux, sans pour autant mettre en danger la situation acquise par les artistes dont la réputation est établie.

Quoi qu'il en soit, voilà, monsieur le président et messieurs, les motifs pour lesquels nous vous suggérons humblement de recommander:

1- Que le problème de la radiodiffusion et de la télévision soit examiné à fond et complètement, en adoptant comme perspective générale la suivante: la formule originale de l'exploitation de la radio et de la télévision, au Canada, repose sur l'existence simultanée d'un secteur étatisé et d'un secteur libre;

2- Que, dans cette perspective et à la lumière de l'évolution accomplie, la place du secteur libre devienne de plus en plus large, afin de fonder la formule dans les faits;

3- Que, pour réaliser ce dessein, on conçoive le rôle du secteur libre comme celui d'une institution majeure et libre, égale au secteur étatisé et entourée des conditions requises à son développement;

4- Que, à cette fin, toute modification du statut de l'exploitation de la radio et de la télévision ne se fasse qu'après consultation de toutes les parties en cause;

5- Que, notamment, même si une telle modification d'ensemble n'était pas souhaitable, au moins le gouvernement canadien prenne les dispositions

voulues pour que cesse le double rôle de juge et de partie que détient Radio-Canada;

6- Qu'il prenne également les dispositions voulues pour que le secteur libre ait la faculté de former des réseaux de postes privés à la télévision comme à la radio;

7- Qu'en tout état de cause, toute modification du statut de l'exploitation de la radio et de la télévision ne se fasse qu'en tenant compte des grandes caractéristiques de la majorité de la population canadienne qui est chrétienne et bilingue;

8- Qu'enfin, toute telle modification tienne compte du fait que l'exploitation de la radio et de la télévision réclame un équilibre entre le secteur étatisé et le secteur libre; cet équilibre a été rompu dès l'origine; il s'est très légèrement rétabli; il reste encore beaucoup de chemin à faire. C'est à hâter le parachèvement de ce redressement que nous vous invitons en soumettant les suggestions et recommandations ci-dessus.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Lavery.

Me deGRANDPRE: Monsieur Lavery, je pense qu'on peut résumer le mémoire en indiquant tout simplement que ce que vous voulez c'est que la radio et la télévision privées soient reconnues d'âge adulte?

M. LAVERY: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Ce qui me frappe à plusieurs endroits de votre mémoire, c'est que vous employez la formule "tôt ou tard"; c'est une expression qui revient à plusieurs reprises dans votre mémoire. Est-ce que je dois comprendre que même dans l'esprit de votre association nous ne sommes pas encore mûrs pour cette évolution, mais que vous la considérez surtout comme devant prendre place d'ici cinq ans ou huit ans ou dix ans?

M. LAVERY: Je ne crois pas que ce soit l'intention de notre association d'avoir soutenu que la radio privée n'a pas atteint l'âge adulte à l'heure actuelle.

Me deGRANDPRE: Voici pourquoi je vous dis cela; c'est qu'à la page 6, par exemple, au premier paragraphe, la dernière phrase, vous dites: "Cependant il faudra tôt ou tard en arriver à permettre aux postes privés d'exploiter la radio et la télévision sur un pied d'égalité avec la radio d'Etat". Un peu plus loin, dans le paragraphe b), la dernière phrase encore :"Tôt ou tard il faudra trouver une formule qui soustraie les postes privés à cette tutelle exercée par un concurrent". Et je vous avoue que la lecture de votre mémoire me laisse croire, à tort ou à raison, - c'est pour cela que je vous pose la question,- que vous ne croyez pas cette solution comme devant être immédiate mais que c'est plutôt dans un esprit constructif étant

donné que la Commission doit prendre des décisions qui peuvent avoir des répercussions sur plusieurs années à venir et que c'est dans cet état d'esprit que vous faites cette suggestion-là?

M. LAVERY: Je crois qu'on peut accepter votre déduction. Maintenant, il est certain qu'à l'heure actuelle, tant qu'il n'y aura pas un organisme régulateur indépendant on ne peut pas demander immédiatement la réalisation de notre suggestion qui est faite dépendamment aussi de la réalisation d'un organisme supra Radio-Canada.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce que ce ne sont pas deux décisions qui sont complètement séparées, à savoir si d'abord on doit en principe faire passer la radiodiffusion privée de son infantilisme à l'âge mûr ou si on doit donner un organisme régulateur. Pour moi il s'agit là de deux décisions distinctes, si vous voulez; peut-être que l'une amènera l'autre; mais je pense qu'il est important tout d'abord de décider si la radio privée doit avoir un plus grand champ d'action.

M. LAVERY: En admettant que la radio privée vienne sur un pied d'égalité avec Radio-Canada, on arrivera à la conclusion qu'il faut un organisme régulateur qui soit au-dessus.

Me deGRANDPRE: Mais cette première décision -- je reviens toujours à l'élément temps -- est-ce que vous la considérez comme quelque chose

qui fera partie de l'évolution lente dans laquelle nous sommes déjà engagés depuis 25 ans?

M. LAVERY: Pas en ce qui a trait à la radio; peut-être à la télévision.

Me deGRANDPRE: Quant à la radio vous dites: "Le moment est venu de briser les liens qui nous ont attachés depuis 25 ans".

M. LAVERY: Maintenant, comme vous le constatez, ce mémoire n'est pas un mémoire de blâme à l'adresse de Radio-Canada; c'est simplement des suggestions que nous faisons en tant que nous ne sommes pas impliqués dans le domaine de la radiodiffusion; c'est plutôt un exposé de principe, et sur un côté nous avons parlé d'influences socialisantes; nous ne disons pas que Radio-Canada est sous l'emprise de ces influences mais nous la mettons en garde. D'ailleurs son propre ministre, le Dr McCann, a dit récemment qu'il y avait des infiltrations. Nous nous permettons de vous rappeler ce fait pour que vous mettiez Radio-Canada en garde contre cette possibilité.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to be clear. You may have touched on this, I am not positive, but I take it from this brief that the Association is asking for an expansion of the role of the private stations from what they have now.

Mr. deGRANDPRE: Sooner or later.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you were asking, as I understood it, about the freedom. Is your association speaking, as it were, in the interests of the private stations- it is their greater freedom that you are concerned with, or is it some greater service that you would like to see given to the people of Canada. In other words, whose interests are you concerned about when you ask for greater freedom for the private stations? Are you asking so that the private stations can do better and make more money, or are you asking because you would like to see a better service for the people of Canada?

M. LAVERY: Il y a la question de réseaux qui a été refusée en télévision aux postes privés.

THE CHAIRMAN: But even taking that attitude, you can favour private entreprise because you think it is a good thing for the private enterprise or because you think it is a good thing for the people of Canada.

MR. GIROUARD: Well, yes because of the principle of favouring private enterprise -I guess that would be the object of the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you see - at the top of page 5 you say that the concession made to the free sector have been too weak and too few -- trop faible et trop peu nombreux" -- too weak in what

sense? We are not going to put it out publicly but we know something about the financial success of the private stations and to put it in general terms our figures seem to indicate that they have done pretty well - how is it too weak because they didn't do better?

MR. LAVERY: I think Mr. Dupont yesterday afternoon made a good case for private stations - that was my impression.

THE CHAIRMAN: Under a system in which he has not done too badly!

MR. LAVERY: He had exceptional experience behind him.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, not all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Behind him.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not at all - oh experience - I thought you said an exceptional record.

MR. LAVERY: No, experience behind him.

THE CHAIRMAN: The figures we have on private stations - which are not by any means complete yet - but certainly indicate that private stations throughout Canada have made a very good economic or business success of their operations - which gave a good return on relatively small investments; which is the very thing we want to see

in this country but why do you say it is "trop faible et trop peu nombreux"? For what purpose? so that they make more money?

MR. LAVERY: It is always a good thing to have private stations in order that the voice of free enterprise be real and complete.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you have now 159 of them!

MR. LAVERY: I think so, but not "en réseaux".

M. TURCOTTE: Puis-je vous demander, M. Lavery, la nature de votre association. Est-ce qu'elle est composée entièrement de maisons industrielles et commerciales de langue française?

M. LAVERY: La plupart de nos membres sont des entreprises canadiennes de langue française dans tous les domaines, non pas seulement dans l'industrie, dans le commerce. Le caractère essentiel pour être membre, c'est d'être employeur dans n'importe quel domaine. Maintenant, nous avons des compagnies canadiennes anglaises.

M. TURCOTTE: En somme, votre association porte un nom français, je vois que vous êtes tous de langue française ici; essentiellement vous êtes un organisme de langue française de la province de Québec?

M. LAVERY: Nous sommes dans la province de Québec. Maintenant, l'industrie canadienne anglaise, nous comptons l'Aluminum, tous les employeurs de l'Aluminum sont membres de l'Association. Nous pouvons vous donner quelques exemples comme ça; mais c'est surtout canadien de langue française.

M. TURCOTTE: Vous dites quelque part à la fin de votre mémoire, à la page 8, paragraphe 7: "Qu'en tout état de cause, toute modification du statut de l'exploitation de la radio et de la télévision ne se fasse qu'en tenant compte des grandes caractéristiques de la majorité de la population canadienne qui est chrétienne et bilingue". Retenons pour le moment le mot "bilingue". Dans votre cas vous vous intéressez naturellement, j'imagine, à la radiodiffusion et à la télévision de langue française.

Et d'autre part, à la page 5, vous dites que Radio-Canada dans le cas de la télévision, ne fait pas suffisamment de concessions au secteur libre dans ce domaine, et vous envisagez des réseaux de postes de télévision qui, j'imagine, seraient de langue française dans votre cas; c'est ce que vous souhaiteriez, j'imagine? Croyez-vous qu'il serait possible et qu'il serait vivable pour des postes de télévision privés dans la province de Québec, de vivre tout en donnant au public de la province de Québec le service qu'ils recoivent maintenant de

Radio-Canada; la même qualité, j'entends.

M. LAVERY: Sur ce point, monsieur le commissaire, je n'ai pas la compétence technique pour répondre.

M. TURCOTTE: Mais là il ne s'agit pas de technique parce que vous savez que c'est très cher la télévision, et que dans le cas du réseau français on peut dire qu'il ne paie pas ses frais, que forcément il vit un peu de subventions générales qui sont accordées d'ailleurs à Radio-Canada dans tous les domaines; mais que s'il était libre, complètement détaché, il serait probablement incapable de vivre précisément parce que cela coûte encore beaucoup plus cher, parce que 80% des programmes de télévision française sont faits dans le pays, ne sont pas importés et coûtent plus cher par la nature même des choses, parce que le marché est moins grand, moins vaste, moins riche, et que s'il était laissé à ses propres moyens il serait obligé de tomber dans une effroyable médiocrité probablement, afin de faire ses frais ou de gagner de l'argent.

Avez-vous songé à cet aspect -- vous dites que c'est un esprit socialisant qui s'est introduit dans le service -- il faut bien dire que si c'était le cas beaucoup de pays que nous appelons des pays démocratiques et d'entreprise libre, l'Angleterre comme la France et plusieurs pays euro-

péens ont également des services de même nature, non seulement de même nature mais excluent complètement l'entreprise privée. Et pourtant ces pays-là ne sont pas des pays socialistes; ce sont simplement des pays qui se sont rendu compte -- à leur point de vue, je ne plaide pas leur cause, je vous expose que ce n'est pas forcément du socialisme -- il y a une raison d'Etat qui est d'autant plus vive dans le cas du Canada qu'il s'agit de faire en sorte d'unir les Canadiens d'un océan à l'autre et deux races, deux cultures et non seulement cela mais des parties du pays qui ne connaissent pas l'autre partie; les gens de Colombie Britannique n'ont pas souvent l'occasion d'aller dans la Nouvelle-Ecosse et vice-versa. Le but est de faire connaître les Canadiens les uns aux autres; et c'est un but qui est une raison d'Etat et à laquelle la raison particulière ne s'intéressera pas forcément.

Si vous envisagez la radio et la télévision comme une industrie, strictement comme une industrie, il peut s'expliquer que l'on ait à l'esprit que le gain. Mais si vous l'envisagez d'abord comme un service à la nation et aux deux éléments, aussi bien l'élément français que l'élément anglais, est-ce que vous ne seriez pas amené alors à aborder le problème d'un tout autre point de vue?

M. LAVERY: Si vous permettez, monsieur

le commissaire, dans notre mémoire on dit que cette concurrence entre les deux secteurs devra se faire suivant les normes établies par un tribunal administratif, et l'organisme régulateur est sous la compétence du gouvernement canadien, et nous demandons qu'elle impose des normes artistiques et même au point de vue éducatif et même au point de vue chrétien de la nation canadienne. Maintenant, je n'ai pas accusé Radio-Canada d'être d'esprit socialisant. J'ai simplement dit à l'Association qu'il y a eu des influences et que nous mettons en garde la Société contre ces influences; et le ministre lui-même, le Dr McCann, l'a dit le 15 aoûtdernier; et à Toronto des mémoires vous ont été soumis sur ces faits. Maintenant, loin de dire que Radio-Canada l'est, mais on la met en garde contre.

M. TURCOTTE: Il s'agit peut-être du cas de quelques individus. Quand il y a plusieurs milliers d'individus, cela est forcé, mais le principe lui-même, diriez-vous que c'est un principe socialisant ou simplement qu'il s'agit de rendre un service public? Est-ce que les Postes canadiennes font du socialisme, par exemple?

M. LAVERY: Non, dans ce domaine-là... Maintenant, vous avons la preuve ici, au Canada, que l'entreprise privée a pu réaliser sa tâche, a fait beaucoup. Les postes qui vous ont soumis des mémoires ont montré ce qu'ils avaient fait. Alors,

c'est un domaine où les deux secteurs peuvent occuper.

M. TURCOTTE: Ces postes privés rendent des services dans le domaine local, dans chaque municipalité, ils rendent de grands services, c'est incontestable; mais sont amenés par la force des choses à négliger certains domaines qui sont plus vastes et qui ne rapportent pas. C'est une tendance naturelle puisque si cela ne rapporte pas et que l'on doit vivre et gagner de l'argent on est forcé d'ignorer certaines choses, et si Radio-Canada ne suppléait pas à cette déficience, à cette carence, ses programmes ne seraient pas apportés au public.

Donc, vous convenez qu'à l'avenir les deux doivent continuer d'exister, mais je pense surtout à ce point de vue des minorités qu'il faut servir, non seulement les minorités linguistiques mais les minorités de goût, de préférence de toutes sortes, des intérêts. Je ne sais pas si vous avez pensé à ce point de vue-là. Il ne faut pas penser seulement au côté gain mais aussi au côté service public à rendre.

M. GIROUARD: Mais, monsieur le commissaire, vous semblez avoir dit au début, vous posez la question à savoir si à cause justement du fait que le service de la télévision est très dispendieux, si l'entreprise privée pourrait vivre si on lui

accordait la permission d'exister dans certains milieux. Cependant, si nous comprenons bien, vous avez eu, ici, à Montréal même, au moins deux demandes de postes de télévision par des entreprises qui ont montré jusqu'ici qu'elles étaient capables de conduire leur affaire de façon profitable et ne devraient pas demander l'autorisation d'avoir un poste dans le but, ou assurées d'avance, que ça ne serait pas profitable.

M. TURCOTTE: Montréal est une très grande ville où il y a un marché; il y a peut-être de la place pour une autre station. Mais que feriez-vous dans un petit patelin comme Rimouski, par exemple, avec un poste de télévision?

M. GIROUARD: Il y en a un actuellement.

M. TURCOTTE: Oui, mais il est commercial et il est quand même alimenté par Radio-Canada. Il faut donc que toujours l'Etat intervienne pour aider; et c'est le cas des postes de langue anglaise également qui, autrement, ou ne vivraient pas ou diminueraient la qualité de leurs programmes.

M. GIROUARD: Nous ne demandons pas évidemment qu'il y ait des postes partout; nous demandons en principe que des postes de télévision privés soient accordés et qu'on permette à ces postes-là également, pour tâcher d'être unis ensemble, -- ça ne veut pas dire qu'il soit possible demain d'avoir des postes reliés de l'Atlantique au Pacifique et que commer-

cialement et économiquement ça serait possible sans subvention, mais prenez dans la province de Québec, par exemple; si vous aviez des postes privés qui pourraient être reliés ensemble dans la province où il y aurait peut-être un service à rendre qui actuellement n'est pas complet.

M. TURCOTTE: Sans aucune subvention de l'Etat sous forme de programmes, sous forme d'argent? Vous croyez qu'ils pourraient nous donner huit ou neuf heures par jour sans aucune aide l'Etat, sans diminuer la qualité des programmes?

M. GIROUARD: Nous ne disons pas que l'Etat ne devrait pas les aider, mais si nous en jugeons par les mémoires privés qui ont été présentés, je ne crois pas que ces mémoires présentés par des maisons responsables pourraient réclamer de l'aide. Peut-être que celles de l'étranger, de l'extérieur auraient besoin d'aide; mais même s'ils avaient besoin d'aide, même si l'Etat les aidait, ce serait un service à rendre. Qu'on dépense une partie de l'argent pour aider des services privés, ça ne serait pas là une chose qui répugnerait aux contribuables, si les services étaient rendus, si on démontre que les services sont rendus par des postes privés.

Me deGRANDPRE: Pour poser la question sous une autre forme: votre suggestion de permettre l'établissement de réseaux de télévision privés, ça implique nécessairement l'abandon de cette politique

du canal unique, et prenant le réseau français - étant donné que c'est celui dont on parle depuis déjà quelque temps - croyez-vous qu'un réseau français de télévision ça ne veut pas tout simplement dire un autre poste à Montréal, en pratique, au point de vue économique?

M. GIROUARD: Surtout, évidemment, c'est ça.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous suggérez un réseau d'un poste, en somme, parce que si vous voulez avoir le réseau d'Etat d'un côté en parallèle, parce que c'est bien la teneur de votre mémoire, où allez-vous trouver les débouchés pour le réseau privé ou pour le réseau d'Etat si vous n'avez qu'un poste dans presque toutes les villes de la province, sauf Montréal?

M. GIROUARD: Voici: quand vous dites que ça comprend -- ça veut peut-être dire d'abord un poste privé additionnel à Montréal; ça ne veut pas dire qu'il ne pourrait pas y en avoir deux -- mais quand nous parlons d'un réseau, il pourrait y avoir dans d'autres régions des postes secondaires qui pourraient être reliés à ce poste privé de façon à ce qu'il y ait une seconde chaîne de télévision française dans la province.

Me deGRANDPRE: C'était précisément la première partie de ma question tout à l'heure.

Croyez-vous qu'au point de vue économique, partout où il y a des éléments français sauf à Montréal, il y a possibilité d'installer un deuxième poste de télévision?

M. GIROUARD: Je ne peux pas dire que partout il y a possibilité.

Me deGRANDPRE: Nommez-moi un autre endroit en dehors de Montréal.

M. GIROUARD: Pourquoi pas Québecet la région du Lac St-Jean?

M. TURCOTTE: A propos de Québec, est-ce que pendant longtemps ce poste de langue française ne donnait pas le tiers de ses émissions en langue anglaise? Dans une ville 95% de langue française, pourquoi le faisait-il? Parce que c'était plus économique pour lui de le faire, pas vrai?

M. GIROUARD: Il ne faudrait pas tout de même interpréter notre requête comme s'adressant exclusivement à des postes privés de langue française.

M. TURCOTTE: Je comprends, mais si vous l'étendez au pays tout entier le problème se pose encore avec plus de gravité, parce que déjà les postes de télévision actuels dans le pays tout entier coûtent extrêmement cher; en ce moment; et dans plusieurs cas il serait peut-être plus

économique, surtout si la ville est petite, parce que nous avons au Canada un phénomène qui se rencontre moins aux Etats-Unis: c'est que le territoire est très vaste et une population clairsemée. Donc il est très difficile de la servir économiquement. Il est facile d'avoir à New-York beaucoup de postes puisqu'il y a sept millions de personnes dans un coin, un peu comme Montréal; mais il faut penser pour le pays tout entier, et je sais bien que vous recommandez pour le pays tout entier. C'est précisément ça. La question se pose de la même façon pour le pays tout entier que vous la posez pour toute la province.

M. GIROUARD: Nous plaçant au point de vue affaires, monsieur le commissaire, on pourrait peut-être suggérer, sans avoir l'expérience, que certaines dépenses que l'on voit sur le réseau international et sur le réseau de RADIO-CANADA pourraient être avantageusement réduites et que cette différence-là étant souscrite au réseau indépendant pourrait aider à cette deuxième réalisation. Enfin, c'est un détail qui paraît au commun des mortels quand on voit les réalisations, on dit : "Voici, il y a, justement parce que c'est peut-être payé par l'Etat, tout en admettant que nous avons parfois de très beaux programmes, on trouverait peut-être à même la dépense d'organisation qui se fait là de quoi alimenter ou aider ce deuxième service

pour l'entreprise privée sans affecter le budget actuel de la télévision nationale.

Me deGRANDPRE: Poussant cette suggestion-là un peu plus loin, monsieur, est-ce que vous désireriez que nous subventionnions deux réseaux? Le réseau d'Etat est clairement subventionné à l'heure actuelle, etlà vous suggérez qu'un deuxième réseau subventionné soit créé?

M. GIROUARD: Dans une région comme Montréal, je ne crois pas que ceux qui ont demandé des postes ont demandé une subvention; mais s'il s'agissait d'accorder pour des services au public des réseaux qui pourraient être subventionnés d'une façon ou d'une autre, en dehors des grands centres, je ne crois pas qu'il y ait plus d'objection defaire des concessions pour aider l'entreprise privée dans un certain sens lorsqu'ils rendent un service, que de dépenser l'argent directement pour un réseau national.

Me deGRANDPRE: Nous sommes en train de relier, au point de vue télévision, le Canada, et il y a des subventions considérables qui sont accordées à l'heure actuelle et à la radio d'Etat et à la radio privée par le fait que les programmes soient fournis aux postes privés, - du moins ce sont les représentations qui nous sont faites à l'heure actuelle et nous les étudierons avec nos aviseurs financiers -- et votre suggestion c'est de donner un

réseau alternatif qui serait également subventionné par l'Etat. Vous doubleriez la dépense?

M. GIROUARD: Je ne crois pas qu'on demande directement l'établissement d'un nouveau réseau; on demande le droit pour des postes privés qui peuvent en faire la demande, d'accorder le droit d'avoir ces postes-là, alors qu'actuellement ces postes-là ne peuvent pas avoir la permission.

Me deGRANDPRE: Il faut tout de même être réalistes et se rendre compte qu'il n'y a pas tellement de centres au pays qui puissent se permettre le luxe de deux postes.

M. GIROUARD: C'est fort possible, nous admettons ça.

Me deGRANDPRE: Alors, si ça ne s'applique qu'à trois ou quatre villes ou cinq villes à travers le pays, croyez-vous qu'un réseau privé constitué de cinq, six ou sept postes privés à travers le pays est économiquement possible sans d'autre subvention, avec comme conséquence d'autres taxes et des impôts qui ne sont pas toujours regardés avec faveur pas vos associations?

M. GIROUARD: Je ne crois pas qu'il soit possible peut-être immédiatement; nous demandons le principe des postes privés de télévision, et d'accorder que ces postes soient reliés.

M. TURCOTTE: Evidemment, relier les postes d'un endroit à l'autre, c'est très cher. Je crois qu'en ce moment c'est très onéreux, même pour l'Etat.

M. GIROUARD: Je ne crois pas qu'il soit possible de relier les postes privés de l'Atlantique au Pacifique pour plusieurs années à venir.

M. TURCOTTE: Vous songez plutôt à des réseaux régionaux?

M. GIROUARD: Bien, ce serait peut-être... si on commence par certains postes privés ça n'enlève pas le principe d'examiner plus tard la possibilité que certains de ces réseaux-là, lorsqu'ils seront suffisamment nombreux, puissent être à un moment donné reliés entre eux.

M. TURCOTTE: Supposons que ceci est accordé. Quel genre de programmes pensez-vous que ces réseaux donneraient au public? Quelle sorte de service rendraient-ils au public s'ils étaient complètement libres de toute ingérence extérieure; où s'alimenteraient-ils pour leurs programmes et quelle serait la nature de leurs programmes? Et envisagez-vous un certain contrôle sur ces postes pour les contraindre à donner un certain genre de programmes, même si ces programmes ne rapportent rien ou s'ils sont peut-être sujets à les mettre en déficit?

M. GIROUARD: Un contrôle.

M. TURCOTTE: Un contrôle exercé par qui?

M. GIROUARD: Par un organisme supérieur.

M. TURCOTTE: Mais cet organisme pourrait les empêcher de faire certaines choses mais non pas les contraindre à faire certaines autres, n'est-ce pas? Il pourrait leur dire :"Vous ne pouvez pas faire telle et telle chose". Il ne pourrait pas leur dire : "A huit heures du soir vous aurez un forum sur une question d'ordre public qui ne vous rapportera rien pendant une heure". Vous admettez cela?

M. LAVERY: Nous allons jusque là.

M. TURCOTTE: C'est de l'interférence de l'Etat dans l'affaire privée, c'est du socialisme.

M. LAVERY: Non. Le socialisme, vous savez, ça dépend jusqu'où il se rend. Lorsque vous éliminez complètement l'entreprise privée vous êtes socialiste, mais il y a certaines normes au point de vue de l'éducation canadienne qui -- l'éducation relève des provinces, les provinces ont des droits, nous les admettons. Ce n'est pas dusocialisme; c'est du nationalisme.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did I understand that correctly?

Me deGRANDPREL This is the question you have in mind, Mr. Chairman.

Me deGRANDPRE: Vous indiquez qu'en matière de vélévision, à la page 3, qu'en matière de télévision et de radiodiffusion, que les provinces ont des droits. Pourriez-vous indiquer ce que vous entendez par ceci?

M. LAVERY: Bien, je crois qu'au point de vue de l'éducation les provinces ont un droit de regard à ce point de vue.

deGRANDPRE: Il s'agit d'éducation?

M. LAVERY: Oui.

Me deGRANDPRE: Par le médium de la télévision.

M. LAVERY: Peut-être que notre phrase est trop générale. Je pense que les communications relèvent du gouvernement fédéral, d'après l'Acte de l'Amérique Britannique du Nord. Mais cependant, au au point de vue éducation il y a des droits privés qui sont en jeu et il me semble que la province pourrait intervenir.

Me deGRANDPRE: Est-ce qu'il n'y a pas une distinction à faire entre le médium et ce que le médium nous apporte?

M. LAVERY: Oui, je pense que la distinction doit être faite.

Me deGRANDPRE: Avec cette distinction-là,

la phrase prend tout son sens?

M. LAVERY: C'est ça.

THE CHAIRMAN: But on a somewhat similar point am I right in having understood from this conversation in connection with networks - that you would like the right to form networks but you don't think they would be formed - economically?

M. GIROUARD: That's right. We sometimes want the right but it will depend upon the interested parties and also the governing body - to make sure that this right can be exercised in due course.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is what I understood.

M. GIROUARD: C'est à peu près la même chose que quand nous demandons un organisme qui réguliserait les postes privés avec les postes d'Etat; ce n'est pas pour nous plaindre de ce qui existe, c'est pour assurer qu'advenant une difficulté il y aurait un moyen d'appel et de régulariser la situation.

M. TURCOTTE: Un conseil semblable se bornerait en quelque sorte à exercer la surveillance, mais c'est ça qui est toujours négatif. Il peut toujours dire "Ne faites pas ceci, ne faites pas cela"; mais s'il n'est pas un élément actif comme Radio-Canada, ce n'est pas lui qui fait le programme.

Donc vous resterez toujours, pour votre service rendu au public, à la merci des désirs ou des préférences de ces postes privés qui donneront au public ce qu'ils croient donner au public. Vous n'avez pas d'action directe; elle est simplement négative, si c'est bien ainsi que vous entendez ce corps public.

Ce n'est pas ainsi qu'on nous l'a proposé jusqu'ici. On nous a toujours proposé ce Independent Regulatory Body comme un organisme qui, en quelque sorte, était arbitre entre les deux dans les cas où ils ne s'entendent pas ou pour passer des règlements. On nous dit :"Vous ne ferez pas de dramatisation de programmes politiques; vous ne passerez pas de discours politiques en deça de 48 heures d'une élection; vous ne ferez pas plus d'annonce que tant par 15 minutes". Vous remarquez bien que ça, c'est négatif toujours; c'est simplement pour empêcher de faire certaines choses; mais il n'y a jamais là un esprit d'initiative qui dit :"Vous ferez ceci à telle heure; il faut donner au public, à telle minorité tel programme; telle autre minorité a besoin de telle ou telle chose à tel moment, vous le leur donnerez".

De sorte qu'en définitive vous laisseriez à l'initiative privée ce qu'elle donnerait au public selon qu'elle croit pouvoir satisfaire la grande majorité du public, et elle le fera dans la mesure de ses intérêts. Si vous concevez la

radiodiffusion comme une industrie qui doit rapporter à celui qui la dirige, fort bien! Mais si vous la concevez surtout comme un service à rendre à la nation canadienne en entier, vous devriez ensuite aborder le problème sur un autre pied complètement. C'est ce que nous sommes tenus de faire.

M. HENRI DAGNEAULT: Voici ce que vise la recommandation suggérant que tout cela se fasse après l'établissement, d'un commun accord, des normes intellectuelles et morales de la nation. Cette intervention ne serait pas une intervention de l'Etat sur un plan économique mais une intervention de l'ordre de la directive. La radio et la télévision, il faut que ce soit aussi parfait que possible dans une fraction de seconde; on ne se reprend pas, on ne recommence pas. Alors, il y a certainement une nécessité de surveillance positive et pratique et immédiate beaucoup plus directe que dans n'importe quelle autre forme d'expression. C'est pour cela que je crois que l'on peut recommander que l'organisme indépendant, supérieur à Radio-Canada et supérieur aux postes privés, détermine des normes morales et intellectuelles assez précises ; et alors on pourra avoir quelque chose de beaucoup plus positif sans que ce soit une intervention dans le domaine économique où Radio-Canada a des programmes commerciaux.

M. TURCOTTE: Vous concevez cet

organisme supérieur et indépendant comme déterminant une politique pour la nation en même temps. Comment peut-il le faire? Il peut le faire s'il s'appelle Radio-Canada, parce qu'il est en même temps celui qui fait la politique et qui l'exécute. Mais s'il doit le faire en même temps pour des entreprises privées qui, elles, sont libres, il peut bien leur dire: "Vous devriez faire telle chose, vous devriez unir tous les Canadiens, vous devriez représenter une section à l'autre". Ce sont des conseils qu'il donne, mais comment peut-il les faire exécuter quand ce n'est pas lui qui fait le programme?

M. DAGNEAULT: Nous avons bien confiance à la commission qui pourrait recommander des choses plus précises que nous pourrions le faire.

M. TURCOTTE: Ils pourront donner d'excellents conseils, mais s'ils ne sont pas en même temps les exécutants ils peuvent se borner à conseiller.

M. DANGEAULT: Je crois qu'on n'a pas eu cette contrainte-là mais on a eu une concurrence directe. Je comprends que la suggestion pose un autre problème, mais je comprends ...

M. TURCOTTE: Dans le régime actuel, Radio-Canada est en même temps celui qui détermine la politique pour la nation et qui l'exécute aussi par l'entremise de ses postes. Les postes privés

font ce qu'ils veulent, sauf passivement, négativement :"vous ne pouvez pas faire telle et telle chose". Ensuite ils font à leur guise. Ils publient les nouvelles à l'heure qu'il leur plaît, ils donneront de la musique ou des romans-savon tant qu'il leur plaît pourvu qu'ils ne dépassent pas la quantité d'annonce commerciale pendant telle période; mais tout cela est négatif; tandis que Radio-Canada a un autre organisme pour agir.

M. GIROUARD: Dans la radio, actuellement, vous avez les postes privés; ils ont leurs propres programmes, ils sont sujets à certaines normes. Je suppose qu'il y aurait intervention, nécessairement, si on ne s'en tenait pas à certaines normes qui sont établies. Alors, est-ce que la même chose ne peut pas se faire pour la télévision? Vous avez déjà un système qui fonctionne pour Radio-Canada. Ca serait la même chose qui s'appliquerait à la télévision.

Savoir s'ils vont vivre ou non, c'est une autre question. Ca appartient aux intéressés de savoir s'ils vont vivre. Evidemment, si ce n'est pas vivable, je suppose qu'on n'en demandera pas. C'est un principe qui est en jeu. Aujourd'hui vous accordez des postes de radio. Je comprends que vous vous assurez qu'il y a place pour ces postes, qu'il n'y ait pas trop de compétition, de façon à ce que ces postes-là puissent vivre; mais enfin, le droit leur

est accordé d'exister. Il y a un droit d'accordé à ce que certains postes puissent se relier entre eux s'ils le jugent à propos; alors que dans la télévision, si je comprends bien, ce droit n'existe pas. Pourquoi n'existerait-il pas?

M. TURCOTTE: Puisque nous parlons du nombre de postes, si nous devons passer à un autre ordre d'idée. Radio-Canada possède en ce moment huit postes. Il en existe 26. Dans le domaine de la radio, le nombre des postes que possède Radio-Canada, je ne m'en souviens pas; mais c'est seulement un pourcentage très bas sur ce qui existe au pays. Diriez-vous qu'à l'avenir Radio-Canada devrait cesser d'installer de ses propres postes, dans la télévision, par exemple, ses huit étant suffisants, et que dorénavant tous les autres canaux qu'il y aurait de disponibles devraient être accordés à des entreprises privées, soit un dans chaque ville ou deux au besoin. Je ne pousse pas la politique du canal unique pour chaque ville; mais croyez-vous que nous sommes déjà allés assez loin en ce moment et qu'à l'avenir tout ce qu'il y aura de disponible devrait être accordé à des postes privés, ou que Radio-Canada doit continuer de s'étendre dans une certaine mesure en télévision? Nous pouvons poser la question pour la radio, si vous voulez aussi.

M. GIROUARD: C'est une opinion personnelle. Je ne suis pas près à dire que la radio et

la télévision doivent nécessairement s'arrêter là. Ca dépend des circonstances. Ca peut dépendre de bien des points de vue.

M. TURCOTTE: Mais vous n'êtes pas contre?

M. DAGNEAULT: Nous n'avons pas déclaré que nous étions contre. Dans le service à donner, il peut y avoir des exigences qui obligent Radio-Canada à s'étendre davantage pour atteindre le plus grand nombre de la population. Il y a certainement là de sa part un rôle de service à remplir.

M. TURCOTTE: Afin de rendre service à la nation toute entière?

M. GIROUARD: Oui. Que la télévision de Radio-Canada, par exemple, s'étende au point de devenir un organisme qui nécessite chaque année des subsides de l'ordre de millions et de millions, avec comme limite ultime on ne sait trop quoi, il me semble que là c'est une toute autre histoire, comme dirait un auteur célèbre. Alors, pour ce qui est de s'étendre vis-à-vis du service, je ne peux pas me prononcer.

M. TURCOTTE: Dans les limites du raisonnable, vous n'êtes pas contre?

M. GIROUARD: Pour ce qui est de s'étendre vis-à-vis de devenir un organisme de production

à n'en plus finir, ad infinitum, là, je crois que c'est plus que discutable. Maintenant, puisque nous sommes dans un immense pays à population relativement clairsemée, il y a lieu de coordonner les efforts des deux. Je ne crois pas que ce soit une impossibilité, au contraire, mais à condition que ce ne soit pas fait avec l'un qui mène l'autre, mais que les deux se parlent d'un pied d'égalité. Il me semble que ça va toujours mieux, c'est toujours plus normal; surtout dans les garanties de droit administratif qui existent dans notre pays.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you gentlemen for your brief.

This concludes our hearings in Montreal. I want to express again our appreciation to the many organizations to preparing and presenting briefs to us here and to repeat my thanks to the authorities of the International Air Transport Body for allowing us to have this very comfortable and very excellent place for our hearings.

We adjourn now and resume on Monday morning in Ottawa for the hearing of a number of briefs mainly from National organizations which will take us most of next week for those briefs.

- - - - - - - - - -

Page 5760 follows

# ROYAL COMMISSION

# ON

# BROADCASTING

## HEARINGS

HELD AT

OTTAWA, ONT. SEPTEMBER 17, 1956

v. 35

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Ottawa, Ontario
Monday,
September 17th, 1956

PRESENT:

| | |
|---|---|
| MR. ROBERT M. FOWLER | Chairman |
| MR. EDMOND TURCOTTE | Commissioner |
| MR. JAMES STEWART | Commissioner |

- - - -

| | |
|---|---|
| MR. JOHN M. COYNE<br>MR. A. J. de GRANDPRE | Counsel |

- - - -

| | |
|---|---|
| MR. PAUL PELLETIER | Secretary |

- - - -

APPEARANCES


CANADIAN FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE 5761
Mr. David Kirk, Secretary Treasurer
Mr. H.H. Hannam, President
Dr. Hope, Economist to the Federation

RADIO-ELECTRONICS-TELEVISION MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION 5811
Mr. J.D. Campbell, President
Mr. F.W. Radcliffe, General Manager
Mr. R.A. Hackbusch, Director of Engineering

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP COUNCIL 5859
Mr. John P. Kidd, Executive Director
Mr. Norman Dowd, Director

CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN 5884
Mr. J.M. Meiklejohn
Chairman, Radio and TV Committee
Mr. A.O. Gibbons, Vice-President

DR. A.R.M. LOWER 5895
Queen's University


- - - -

## CANADIAN FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE

Appearances:

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr. David Kirk, | Secretary-treasurer |
| Mr. H.H. Hannam, | President |
| Dr. Hope, | Economist to the Federation |

---

THE CHAIRMAN: Our first submission is that of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and we will begin by marking that brief as Exhibit 203, and I understand that Mr. David Kirk, the secretary-treasurer, of the Federation of Agriculture is here; is that correct?

MR. KIRK: Yes.

EXHIBIT NO. 203: Brief of Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you alone, Mr. Kirk?

MR. KIRK: No, I have here two gentlemen from our organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: They can both come up with you in case you want some actual or moral support.

MR. KIRK: Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to introduce my colleagues here. The first one is the president of our organization, Mr. H.H. Hannam, and at the end of the table is Dr. Hope, economist to the Federation of Agriculture.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it, Mr. Kirk, you are going to present the brief, but in our questioning

either of your associates may take part in the answers in any way they see fit. We want all the help we can get from you.

MR. KIRK: Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I think it would be just as well if I did not read the whole of this brief, as you have had it in your hands for some time but if I may, I would like to go through it and repeat and read and comment on some parts of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Make a full presentation of it, but I agree it is better not to read the whole thing.

MR. KIRK: The Commission has had before it for some time copies of a statement of policy regarding radio and television which was approved in January of this year by the Board of Directors of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture.

This statement is incorporated in full in this presentation, and it begins with these words;

"The very great impact which radio has made upon our national life and culture will probably be exceeded by the additional influence of the new communications medium of television. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture is deeply aware of the importance of both these forms of broadcasting in the future of this country, and for this reason wishes to set out the following statement of policy regarding radio and television."

I would like to refer briefly to some of the points brought out in this policy. The first is basic, that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture

supports the basic principle that in the fields both of radio and television there should be one national system to provide broadcasting as a public service to the people of Canada.

In saying this the Federation wishes to make it clear that it thoroughly approves of the fact, as a unique development in Canada, there is a thriving group of privately owned radio stations, operating within the National system and especially suited to the giving of community service which has developed. This pattern of radio broadcasting thus established has proved extremely suited to the needs and tastes of the people of Canada. The same pattern is being and should continue to be developed in the field of television.

The statement of policy then goes on to point to two of the basic conditions which we believe must determine the nature of Canadian broadcasting policy. The first is that broadcasting is by its nature a monopoly or partial monopoly.

The second is that Canada is a country of very large area and relatively small population which results in the cost per listener being higher.

The kind of policy that has developed in the light of these determining conditions, we feel should have the same objectives as were set out by the Royal Commission on National development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture endorses these objectives, which were put in the form of three points:

First, an adequate coverage of the entire population.

Second, opportunity for Canadian talent and Canadian self-expression.

Third, a successful resistance to the absorption of Canada into the general cultural pattern of the United States. In the case of this last point we are inclined to think the objective could better be put positively; that is, a successful development of a broadcasting service which expresses and helps to evolve the Canadian type of culture.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I suppose Mr. Kirk, you are suggesting it would be a uniquely Canadian thing having regard to the fact that we are here.

MR. KIRK: That is right, and it is not a hostility to America as such.

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. KIRK: I think that the next point I should bring out is that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture sees no need for a change in the law to allow for a separate regulatory body. We feel that such a set-up within the proposal implies that two systems of broadcasting could exist side by side in this country. and we feel if there were two systems, each deserving of impartial treatment from some overall body, that the result would inevitably be that no truly National broadcasting service could survive. That is the essence of our position on that point, and we also think it is important to keep in mind, although it is not the most important feature

of the thing that to attempt to provide an adequate public broadcasting service at the same time as you had a parallel private broadcasting system, if you were to do the public job properly, it would be an extremely expensive thing, and we think there is a great deal to be said for providing for an adequate use of the commercial potentialities of television by the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to understand that point, Mr. Kirk. Is this because you feel that the existence of two separate systems would have a cost effect on the public system? In theory, if you had a completely existing public system, why do you say you can't have a private system alongside it. You seem to suggest that the costs would go up for the public system: is that your pint?

MR. KIRK: Yes, I think they would in the sense the public system today incorporates commercial. The thought was, if it was purely a non-commercial public system --

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean, as some briefs have suggested -- not many, but a few -- if the commercial activities of CBC be given up, then, of course, it would increase the cost?

MR. KIRK: That is right. We would like to emphasize that with the advent of television the radio field is faced with a new challenge, and we are aware of this and we feel that both the means and encouragement should be given to the

meeting of this challenge, because we were certain that a great communication medium like radio has by no means begun to outlive its usefulness.

On the question of financing in our statement of policy we basically take the position that the amounts of money provided by the Government of Canada to the CBC should be generous.

In approving this statement of policy the Canadian Federation of Agriculture is consistently following a position which it has taken for many years. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture is truly a federation in its form and constitution, and therefore reflects the views of individual farmers as they are expressed through direct membership farm organizations, farm cooperatives, commodity groups of various sorts and special organizations such as agricultural societies. The unanamity of opinion which the Canadian Federation of Agriculture finds expressed in support of Canada's basic policy of radio and television broadcasting and which the Commission has encountered in submissions by a number of our member organizations is, we think, significant. We say this in view of the fact that probably no large group in the Candaidn population has been more vitally concerned than has Canada's farm population with the nature and quality of the broadcasting service which it has received. In the relative isolation of farm life the contact of radio, and now for many, the television set, is a very large addition to the opportunities available for entertainment, inspiration and instruction.

The farmer's experience with Canadian radio in general has been, as far as we can determine, a happy one. In addition, he has two special reasons for setting a high value upon our National broadcasting system.

First, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

has developed a farm broadcast service which has been of inestimable value to people who, though individually in business in only a relatively small way, nevertheless must each keep abreast of the technical and market developments that are so vital to their welfare.

The realization of those opportunities, one outstanding example we would like to mention, is the National Farm Radio Forum, a unique and world famous experiment in adult education which combines weekly national broadcasts on agricultural topics with a nation-wide network of neighbourhood discussion groups in which whole families can and do participate. The National Farm Radio Forum programme has for various reaons been more widely used in some provinces than in others, but it has been active and important in all, and after 15 years of existence there are very real signs that far from becoming worn out and obsolete as an idea and a programme it is going to become still more closely woven into the fabric of our way of life.

With the coming of television enormous new challenges, opportunities and problems have appeared. There is no doubt whatever that in this new medium a cultural force of tremendous importance has been introduced into our society. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture is sure that the farm people of this country, taking them by and large, subscribe to the idea that only an independent public authority should be entrusted with the job of developing, over the years, a truly Canadian broadcasting service.

It would be wrong if in discussing this important question of public policy we did not emphasize our awareness that a broadcasting system is not just another public utility. The development of a national broadcasting service is a creative undertaking and the fundamental case for a single and publicly owned Canadian system of broadcasting is simply this: that a truly Canadian service should be created, and this decision having been made the task of making such a service a reality must be entrusted to and be made the full responsibility of an overall public agency which is permitted maximum independence of action, and which actually embodies the national service and is not merely a referee or a subsidiary programme production service.

Having established the Federation's position in a general way, we would like to comment briefly on a few more specific problems and issues.

As our statement of policy makes clear, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture fully recognizes and values the place of private stations in our broadcasting system. It recognizes of course that the National association of which these stations are members -- the Canadian Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters -- takes a different view from ours as regards national broadcasting policy. But though we differ with this association on broad issues, we would like to make clear that we are fully aware of the invaluable role which

private stations play in their provinces and communities in giving service which a national system could not very well provide. A great many private radio stations have assumed a role in the life of their communities, including the rural life, which is greatly valued by our members and member organizations across Canada, and this experience is being repeated in television.

As far as our knowledge goes, the history of private radio stations has been a successful one, financially speaking, and the same will no doubt be true in the field of television. It is perhaps understandable that private broadcasters would like the idea of entering into the field of broadcasting independent from the CBC and the responsibilities and limitations which the present system imposes on them. Yet it is only fair to remember that all private television stations now in existence applied for licenses in full knowledge of the nature of Canada's present policy. Provided they are treated fairly and reasonably they cannot successfully charge that injustice is being done them, though they have of course a right and indeed a responsibility to express their opinions regarding the soundness of our national policy.

The first term of reference refers to the policies to be followed by the CBC in its television broadcasting activities and the relation of such policies to the finances of the Corporation. In this connection we would like to comment on the fear

which is sometimes expressed that an institution like the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is a dangerous, if perhaps as yet largely a potential threat to our freedom of thought and expression -- of our freedom of the press as extended in principle to the new communications mediums of radio and television broadcasting. This question is of course a vital one -- always to be taken seriously and given the most careful attention, whether the supposed danger lies in crude and obvious attempts to suppress unwanted expressions of opinion or in the more subtle forms of censorship which spring from fear or timidity or self-interest or simply authority wedded to indifference. But the Canadian Federation of Agriculture fails really to see that the CBC should be looked upon as a threat to our freedom of speech. Broadcasting is by its nature at least semi-monopolistic and is not comparable in nature to the public press. Whatever public or private organizations may have control of what goes out over the airwaves will have a public responsibility for preventing radio and television broadcasting in the field of opinion becoming a vehicle for the ideas of a few men or interested groups, yet at the same time for ensuring that it provides lively, challenging and controversial expressions of opinion on matters of public interest. The question is whether this responsibility is likely to be exercised better by an agency like the present CBC or by some other system. We would observe that in the first place the degree

of freedom which is given to private stations at present to use their own or their sponsors time for the uncensored reporting of the news and for the full expression of opinion is as great now as it would likely be under any other agreement. Moreover, the nature of commercial broadcasting, in which sponsored programmes are normally identified with the sponsor and in which the object is to present programme material which will be liked and accepted without dissent by as wide an audience as possible, puts a premium on the avoidance of controversy.

We would suggest that what is best suited to our needs is a public corporation which is allowed to operate free of government interference and which is supported by public funds to enable Canadian broadcasting to become a vital force in the development and expression of opinion. We would unhesitatingly agree of course that the success of such a system depends on making the freedom of the CBC in this regard a right that is jealously guarded by both parliament and the CBC itself, and one which will and we very much hope in the future be respected without difficulty or question by all governments, organized groups and individuals within the country. This is a special type of experiment in the exercise of democratic freedoms -- adapted to the special nature of broadcasting, and we think it would be very unwise to throw overboard our present philosophy of broadcasting out of a fear, so far unfounded, that we can't make this new experiment work.

We think it is the best answer in the broadcasting field, perhaps I should just note at the top of page 10, that if this inquiry and criticism arose in the House it would be very good. Nevertheless there is in our opinion grave danger that this principle is compromised, at least in the eyes of the public, if the Minister undertakes to transmit the views of the CBC in answer to inquiries and criticisms. Inevitably the Minister is in danger of becoming identified with the views and opinions expressed. Our suggestion is that the British practice be followed -- that when these inquiries and criticisms arise the Minister not undertake to reply to them or obtain a reply but that all questions and criticisms be left for discussion with CBC officials in committee. This would make it absolutely clear that it is solely parliament's affair to enquire into CBC affairs, and no part of the government's responsibility.

The Minister has said and made it very clear on a number of occasions, and quite properly, that he is just a liaison between the public and the government.

As far as the detailed policy necessary to developing a national system of broadcasting is concerned, we would not attempt to undertake any extended analysis. We would only repeat that the CBC should be encouraged by everyone to operate in the freest possible atmosphere of tolerance for the opinions, interests and tastes of others.

The second of the Commission's terms of reference refers to the measures necessary to provide an adequate proportion of Canadian programmes for both public and private television broadcasting. This brings us, of course, to one of the fundamental reasons for the CBC system. We know that it has been made very clear to the Commission that television broadcasting is an expensive business. Even in the much less expensive field of radio it was always a non-economic proposition, from a purely commercial point of view, to develop any very elaborate Canadian programme production. Unless one questions the assumption that it is desirable to do a large amount of purely Canadian programming -- and the C.F.A. does not question this assumption, but on the contrary warmly supports it -- then the need for considerable expenditures of non-advertising money is evident.

One point that we would like to make in this connection is that in our view there is more to Canadian programming than simply production of programmes in Canada. A national programme schedule may and should have considerable numbers of U.S., British and French programmes in it. Yet by the process of selection of these imported programmes, and their co-ordination with Canadian productions into the total bill of fare, the whole schedule becomes, in a sense, a Canadian product. It is this Canadian broadcasting system that we are after, in which Canadian programmes must play a major role, rather than merely access to Canadian

programmes. No change of present policy should be made, therefore, which would undermine this ability and responsibility of the CBC not merely to produce Canadian programmes, but to operate a Canadian broadcasting system. We do not see what point a separate regulatory board would have for example, unless it were intended to establish private broadcasting on a basis of independence from CBC stations and network requirements.

We feel such a basis of independence would be a very unfortunate thing. On the question of alternative services, speaking of Canadian programmes and programming naturally raises the question of alternative services, in areas where this may be provided. It seems clear that the operation of second stations would mean increased cost to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the amount depending upon the type of arrangements adopted in connection with the second station.

The CFA, of course, has a special interest in this matter of extending television coverage to the twenty per cent of the people to whom it is not now available. These will be farm people to a large extent and we believe that funds should be provided to extend coverage to the bulk of this remaining twenty per cent of the people. We would like to see the Commission recommend that this be done, and that moreover it be done reasonably soon. The process has not yet been completed even in radio because there are still some areas to which we could extend our radio coverage.

Reference has been made to the invaluable services rendered to Canadian agriculture by the farm broadcast services. This type of service should be continued in radio and provision made for an imaginative use of television for farm programming. It is not our thought that the present noon broadcast and farm radio forum should simply be transferred to television, but that the present service be supplemented with programmes which will, by use of the visual nature of television, open up new fields for informing the farmer and also the town and city listeners. If there is any general criticism to be made of broadcasting of agricultural subjects in both radio and television in Canadatoday, it is that there is too great a tendency to confine it to programmes which have been particularly developed for farm people, and are so identified in the minds of listeners.

On the central question of financial

requirements it is of great interest and I think I will read most of this. It is our hope that this Commission will firmly support the basic system of broadcasting in Canada as it is now set up, and that in doing so it will recommend that the financial provision made by the Parliament of Canada be sufficiently generous that the success of this great experiment will not be jeopardized by lack of funds.

Then we mention the $15 per year. I understand that is a mistake. This figure has been used as being a calculating basis that the CBC has used in recent times. We have no doubt whatever that the revenues of the Corporation must be enlarged considerably beyond this level.

1. Funds should be provided to extend television coverage to a large proportion of the twenty per cent of the population now out of reach of television and to complete the expansion of radio coverage.

2. Funds should be provided for the development of good school broadcast services.

3. An enlargement of farm broadcast services in television, and other special services which may be shown to be of real value, should not be prevented through lack of revenue.

4. While commercial sources of revenue should be exploited to the fullest extent consistent with the development of a good and creative national television service, this qualification must be recognized as a vital and important one. The criteria for success in commercial television

is simply the number of listeners who can be attracted, and this criteria is by no means the only one that should determine programm selction.

5. The freedom of action of the CBC must be maintained, and this too has financial implications. Whatever its level of revenues, the CBC should not, ideally, gear its operations so that it is always next door to insolvency. Itmust feel free to select and reject, to experiment, and to stick up for its own view when this differs from that of the advertiser. But such a wise policy of keeping expenditures something below revenues will not be possible if the amount of funds available to the CBC are so small that the insistent demands of the public for services are running ahead of the ability of the Corporation to fill them.

6. No doubt, too, the Commission has inquired closely into the plans, hopes and we would add dreams of the CBC in connection with the future of radio and television broadcasting in Canada. Creative ideas are rather intangible things but they are the seed from which a Canadian broadcasting service that we can be proud of will spring. The Federation hopes that the Commissioners have been impressed with the creative potential in the CBC and that they will recommend that adequate money be provided to realize this potential.

In short, the provision of public funds which by some means must be made to the CBC should be on a generous scale. We have seen suggestions made that the CBC is wasteful in its expenditures,

and no doubt the Commission has looked closely into the operations of the CBC from this point of view. It is not a subject upon which the Federation can speak with competence. We would fully grant the importance of ensuring that the public's money is not squandered needlessly. On the other hand, we would emphasize that if the building of a truly Canadian broadcasting service is worth doing, it is worth doing well. It would be quite the wrong kind of economy to endanger the success of Canadian broadcasting, either in radio or television, by refusing it amounts of money which, considered in relation to its enormous importance to our national life and culture, are after all quite small.

All our remarks on the subject of finances have been put in general terms, since we do not feel competent to express our recommendations in terms of dollars and cents. This we would leave to the Commission, who will have had the opportunity to acquire pretty accurate ideas of what is required under different assumptions as to policy and programming.

We do not feel we can add much to the question of how the funds should be established. It seems to us unlikely that the collection of a license fee is the best solution. Such a fee is expensive to collect,and is the type of tax which many people will inevitably consider as a nuisance. It must be recognized that numbers of people will object to the payment of such a tax through simple indifference to the issue of Canadian broadcasting

policy. This would be true of a special tax to support any national policy in the public interest -- such as technical assistance to underdeveloped nations, a national library, museum or gallery, conservation of wildlife, and so on.

The answer, we believe, is direct appropriation of Federal funds, on some statutory basis that would serve the twin purposes of (1) enabling the CBC to plan its operations and capital expenditures for several years into the future with a firm knowledge of its probable revenues, and (2) keeping its operations altogether free of supervision and control by the government.

The CBC must be responsible to Parliament, not to the Government. This is elementary. It must also be free of the necessity of having the basis of its finances reviewed annually, or even every two or three years. Whatever statutory provision for financing is set up it must be in such form as to provide reasonable assurance of adequate funds for a substantial number of years ahead.

We would observe that we attach considerable importance to the audience research activities of the CBC. If we are going to entrust the shaping of Canadian broadcasting to a public corporation, that corporation should avail itself of modern tools for assessing the needs of the Canadian public and the impact on the public of its policies and of the medium itself. With regard to audience research we think it is a good thing to be going forward, but we know it is not the do-all and end-all; it is a

substitute for inspiration, and it has very great pitfalls and must be used with care and profundity or not used at all.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Mr. Kirk, on page 2 of your brief in the section having to do with national policy, you pose two fundamental conditions which you suggest justify the type of national policy in radio, which you recommend. The first condition is that there are technical limitations to the number of radio and television channels and that, therefore, there is at least a fairly monopolistic nature to the medium. It has been suggested to us by some technically competent people that to a large degree this notion of limitation of channels has a technical limitation which is unreal, that in point of fact there are ample, or can be developed, ample radio and television channels and that the real limitation is always going to be economy, that is, that we are always going to have as many stations as we can afford. I suppose that is in the same sense that we have as many daily newspapers as we can afford. Just assuming that to be so, for the purpose of my question, does the Federation's viewpoint as to what policy should be in radio and television depend upon that technical limitation of channels which may or may not be so, according to the technicians?

MR. KIRK: Well, no, I hardly think that

MR. KIRK: Well no, I hardly think that the Federation's policy would stand or fall on that technical nature of things, no. I think that we have understood that there are definite limitations on broadcasting channels; if, as you suggest, these limitations did not exist, that at a price they could be provided, well then if that is so it is so and, of course....

MR. COYNE: I am not saying "of course", I am just suggesting the possibility.

MR. KIRK: When it comes to that, I am not well enough informed technically as to whether that is true or not but I would think that the second of these two points would still have very great bearing, that you must consider the cost after all.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are saying in effect, Mr. Kirk, that it is going to be confined to a limited number of broadcasting outlets and you do not care whether it is technical or economical confines or any other, there are going to be relatively few of them and, therefore, you are in this area of limited numbers of participants in the field?

MR. KIRK: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I think Mr. Coyne is quite right in pointing to some evidence we have had that the assumption that the limit is a technical limit might not be right; we do not know yet.

MR. COYNE: I take it from your answer that you would be prepared to support your general conception of what the national policy in broadcasting should be even if there was not any rigid

limitation on the number of channels?

MR. KIRK: oh, yes.

MR. COYNE: Then, just turning the page, if you will, still dealing with your submissions on policy, in paragraph 6, at the top of page 3, you refer to the provision of networks and the fact that under present policy this has been almost wholly a CBC concern. You say:

> "The Canadian Federation of Agriculture believes that it is not possible to plan and carry on a national broadcasting service in the public interest on any other basis."

I would just like to put this proposition to you: let us assume a national network service, operated by the CBC in the manner, let us say, in which it is now developing radio, which is serviced, dispersed or broadcast in part through CBC stations and in part through affiliated private stations. Assuming a continuance of that service, and perhaps even an extension of that service, if that was desirable and possible, why is there an objection to permitting unaffiliated stations outside that service to form some kind of a network, any kind of network they may want to form, for the purpose of providing something additional to the national service?

MR. KIRK: I don't know if it involves any threat to a national service.

MR. COYNE: I am sorry.

MR. KIRK: If it involves no threat to a national service in any connection, well, I don't think it is possible to very successfully take the position that something added, something completely extra, is a bad thing. I didn't like to be put into the position of suggesting this.

MR. COYNE: Would it be fair to summarize the points that you are making here along these lines, that the important consideration is the national service, and it must be protected at all times?

MR KIRK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, while you are on that point, if you had a second network such as Mr. Coyne suggests, would you feel that the possibility of competition from a second network might improve the whole situation, might improve the service?

MR. KIRK: No, I am sorry, sir, I don't feel that. I find it a little difficult to answer a question like that quickly, -- you say a second service?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: An alternative network made up of these stations which are not at the moment part of the CBC network. You would then have a competitive situation, and it has been put to us that through the competition there would be an improvement in the programmes in the whole aspect of broadcasting.

MR. KIRK: Well, I am inclined to think that the competition would take the form of competition for national advertising.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, that might be the ultimate result, but the immediate objective, I should say, would be to gain audience, and if you are going to gain audience you have to put on something better than your competitor, and it has been put to us as a result of these factors your programme is going to improve.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, either better or more popular, to use your own phrase.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes. I won't go into a discussion of quality now, but it might have more popular appeal. I would just like an expression of your opinion on this subject.

MR. KIRK: Well, of course in the first place I would not attempt to talk, quite frankly, about the quality or other considerations, but that is one of the reasons we have a national broadcasting system. I think quality definitely comes into it. The reason I started out with advertising was because there are certain programmes that are popular.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

MR. KIRK: Who is going to get these programmes? I don't frankly see there being enough business in Canada to develop another full-fledged broadcasting network. You are talking of another network in addition to what we have?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

MR. KIRK: Now, if we are just turning away national broadcasting business to that extent -- which I doubt very much -- so that the existing systems can continue in full flower, --- I find it difficult to take any position in opposition to this system. As I said before, I don't see that you can quarrel with getting something altogether in addition to what you have -- something further, but I feel that it wouldn't work out that way. For example, at the moment -- you are speaking of setting up a whole new network of stations in addition to the stations we have, and the stations we have, or a great many of them, are in the networks now.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: There are quite a few, yes, but there are quite a lot that are not affiliated, as I understand it, and the requirements of setting up a network are not too difficult.

MR. KIRK: To get rolling an adequate national network I would have thought it would have involved more stations or the utilization of some of the stations that exist in the present network.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, that I don't know.

MR. KIRK: You see, there are many, or I suppose there are many, networks. There is the affiliation with American stations, I would imagine, which would be one type of network; then there is the regional networks. Both of these systems impinge upon, or they are a different orientation to, the nation service. I would think

that if they were highly successful that probably stations which were not part of these networks -- private stations -- would want to participate in them, and I am afraid that you might end up not merely with a new national broadcasting service in addition to what we have, but with very great pressures on the national service to make processes that would damage this service in some degree, without any of the opportunities and possibilities of the subsidiary network services that might be built up, perhaps, at some other places.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you saying then, Mr. Kirk, that you don't think you could, at the present stage of our economy, have a second national radio network without either that network being a not very satisfactory one, or without some effect being felt by the existing national system. In other words, you can't just isolate it from the national network or avoid the impact of the new network?

MR. KIRK: I would not think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am just trying to find out what you are saying; I am not trying to put words into your mouth.

MR. COYNE: Just moving on, then, to a somewhat different subject, but still on page 3, paragraph 7, you referred to the development of a radio system in which there is a national service and there are also private stations providing local services, outside the national system, and then, if I understand you correctly, you look forward to the similar development in television

over the years. Is that a fair statement, Mr. Kirk?

MR. KIRK: Yes, I would rather expect that would be the effect.

MR. COYNE: Then, I would just like to put this question to you: it has been suggested to us that one reason why we have not that type of development in television at the moment is because of the existence of the so-called single channel policy under which, at present, the Government will not license any television station in an area where there already exists one station -- whether it is the CBC or the private station.

MR. KIRK: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Has the Federation any views specifically on that single channel policy, and particularly, as to whether it should be maintained, or, in the alternative, should be abondoned?

MR. KIRK: No, I think that the Federation, as I have understood it, feels that the single station policy has as its purpose to protect -- well actually I suppose its main purpose is to protect the economic position of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in those centres where you might possibly have two stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the single channel policy goes a bit further than that. It also is protecting the economic position of the private station in places where they are.

MR. KIRK: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the stated purpose

of the single channel policy is quite clearly described in that its desire is to get an even spread of television across Canada, which is the first step.

MR. KIRK: But again it is related to cost. There is a big cost involved in doing this, and I would think the financial burden involved is part and parcel of the consideration. It always seems to me that you have a problem in doing such a thing which is related to public cost.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been put to us that we are now at a stage where there are people who are prepared to establish second stations, at least in some cities throughout Canada, and that this can be done with no public cost other than the indirect one, arising from the cost of goods and services involved. Has your Federation any views on whether this single channel policy has reached the point where it should be abandoned or it should be continued or should be continued for a time?

MR. KIRK: I don't really think I could say that this is a stage where a second station could be put in at no cost and with no deleterious effect on the present broadcasting system. I am not competent to say whether that is true or not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I wasn't asking you that question.

MR. KIRK: That is true; I don't know. I think it would be pretty hard to justify closing permanently the operations of additional stations just for no grounds.

MR. COYNE: There is really a question of time involved in your mind, then?

MR. KIRK: Yes, I would think so. I think that is implied in the statement we have made on the subject.

MR. COYNE: In going on to the next paragraph, which is No. 8, dealing with the question of a separate regulatory body, you say:

> "The suggestion has frequently been made, however, that private and public enterprise in Canadian broadcasting should function separately and independently, under the overall authority of a separate regulatory board. There is only one broadcasting system by law in this country, of which the CBC and the privately owned stations are component parts. A separate regulatory body therefore has no useful function under this system."

Then in the next paragraph you say:

> "We feel that if there are two systems, each deserving of impartial treatment, the result would inevitably be that no truly national public broadcasting system could survive."

Of course, this separate regulatory body that has been put forward to us has been suggested in quite a number of different ways with quite a number of different facets to it. Certainly not all of them necessarily contemplate that they involve

two systems.

MR. KIRK: Oh, I see.

MR. COYNE: The complaint, or one general complaint, that has been put to us is merely that the regulatory and the operational functions of the CBC are in the same hands and it has been thought, or has been urged, that there is at least in different fields, competition between the private stations and the CBC, and that is unfair, that the CBC should also regulate them. I would just like to put to you for your comments, if you have any, this question: would it not be possible for a regulatory body, charged with the regulation and control of broadcasting in Canada, as the CBC is now charged, to separate from the purely operational side of the CBC? Could that type of system exist without, as you say, destroying the truly national public broadcasting system?

MR. KIRK: When you say regulational as opposed to operational, purely operational that is, I suppose that one type of regulation that may be referred to would be regulations on the requirements for the carrying out of Canadian Broadcasting Corporation programmes.

MR. COYNE: I suppose.

MR. KIRK: This to me is hardly a purely regulatory function. This is a programming function also. We don't really feel that it could be divorced from the requirements for carrying out Canadian programmes. It is part of the business of building a programme schedule. It

is part of the production. We think that the production and the regulation, in the sense of networks carrying sustaining programmes and so on, are all part and parcel of the job of putting on television service or radio service.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you really saying therefore that the distinction between regulations and operations is not a precise one?

MR. KIRK: Well, I must confess that I have always found it very difficult to see where the distinction lies in this particular problem.

MR. COYNE: Just perhaps summarizing on this point, would it be fair to put it this way: that in your view there should be a single system in the particular sense in which you use this term, and that if you have a single system a separate regulatory body has no proper function to perform?

MR. KIRK: There is only one system.

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. KIRK: This is the idea.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: There is a debate on that subject too which we have heard a lot about.

MR. KIRK: This is our concept, that basically and fundamentally the private stations are part of the system which is the responsibility of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and in that sense a subsidiary to the CBC.

MR. COYNE: I suppose, in logic, you would admit that if there were two systems, then some sort of regulatory body applying to both would make some sense?

MR. KIRK: Yes, I have never been able to see -- as a matter of principle, if you have two runners in a race you don't let one of them be the referee, but this is not the position, I don't think

in broadcasting policy.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Assuming that a good case could be made out, as efforts have been made to us to make it out, that there is competition in this field, the basis for that view is that there is no reason for existence of any of these broadcasting stations unless they get audience, and in that sense both the private stations and CBC are in competition. I take it that if that were approved and accepted, you would consider then that an independent regulatory body might have some reason for coming into being; is that correct -- as a statement of your views?

MR. KIRK: No, I would say if this was purely the situation -- like these runners in the race idea -- I would not deny for a moment there are competitive elements in that situation. In my province of Saskatchewan, if you have a CBC station at Watrous broadcasting certain programmes, and Regina broadcasting another, and the Regina station is trying to sell time, then in a sense it is in competition with the CBC station. I would certainly not grant, having that degree of competition, you must then go ahead and have a regulatory body. I don't think that is a good enough reason. I was saying if there are two systems that are really comparable, and I don't think there are.

THE CHAIRMAN: You would say, Mr. Kirk, that having the two runners in a race, and one being a referee, it would be inconsistent with the situation where you have a captain on a relay team?

MR. KIRK: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Even though there may be a little competition in that team?

MR. KIRK: Yes, of course.

MR. COYNE: Turning to a somewhat different subject, Mr. Kirk, really the substance of farm programmes as such, on page 5 you refer to a number of broadcasts of different types which deal particularly with the farm audience; are any of those broadcasts, as far as the CBC is concerned, sponsored commercially at the moment, do you know?

MR. KIRK: No.

MR. COYNE: Well, my question is, whether the Federation in respect of these programmes would feel that commercial sponsorship was objectionable in principle, bearing in mind, of course, the extent to which commercial revenues are available, the CBC has a larger amount of revenues to devote to useful purposes. Is there any objection in principle to the sponsorship of farm programmes?

MR. KIRK: Well, I think there is an objection to it, yes, in principle, because I don't think that the Federation would support the sponsoring in a general way of farm broadcasts because we do feel -- well, in the first place we are not altogether convinced it is possible to carry on broadcasting on a sponsored basis without giving some consideration to the people who are paying for the sponsorship to make sure of a success. We would just as soon see this element missing altogether from farm broadcast series.

MR. COYNE: That is, you feel there would be some influence exercised by the sponsor over the content of the programme?

MR. KIRK: That is one aspect of it, but the other side of it is that from the listener's point of view we would much prefer this come as a public service. We would prefer not to see this coming to the listener as a sponsored service, because I doubt if the sponsorship would pay for it all, and I think it is an invaluable service, a service that Canada and the CBC can be proud of, and I think they should keep it as their own and keep it in the minds and the views of the farmers that it should be their service as part of the service of the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: Don't you think people have become pretty realistic in their knowledge as to this business of sponsorship. Throughout Canada at the moment we have all kinds of news broadcasts on private stations -- not on CBC: do you think anybody is in any doubts as to the fact these news broadcasts are not influenced by those sponsors, that they are not allowed to influence them? Have we not moved on to a point where people are not going to be misled by the fact of sponsorship -- or have we?

MR. KIRK: Well, this is a big subject. I am not convinced we have moved on to that stage. I really am not convinced. A sponsor gets a stake in a programme, and if it is a successful programme he has got a stake in it. He is identified with it to some extent, and if it turns out good he may

not want to change it. I just feel that on sponsored broadcasting in fields at least like this farm broadcasting and news broadcasting -- as for instance, in news broadcasting you can put on news different ways, different selections of news; they are all designed for listener audience, and they are such vital fields and so important that they be put on a sound and imaginative service basis that I really cannot feel it is a healthy thing to have these programmes broadcast commercially. Have you anything to say on this?

MR. HANNAM: I think the people of Canada would prefer to have a service that is their service, and not a service that is sponsored by some private interests. I think the effect on the people themselves is that they have more confidence in a service t they listen to which is not sponsored than one that is, and the general effect on the people of Canada is better than if they were sponsored broadcasts.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Is there an interest in influence, or an influence of it, in broadcasting? For instance, a sponsor of gasoline or cigarettes has no interest in farming, but it would bring revenue to the CBC. Take the example of Player's cigarettes: they would have no earthly interest in trying to influence the service as such, and it would be a source of revenue to the CBC which is much needed. You might object to sponsors such as Massey-Harris who may want to influence the farmers, but what about gasoline or cigarettes?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Or boots and shoes?

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Yes, things of that sort. It would be a very substantial source of revenue to the CBC and would not in any way influence the broadcast. What do you think? In other words you might object to a certain type of sponsor and not to another type of sponsor, but that would be left to the discretion of CBC to choose the right kind of sponsor who would not want to influence and not even be suspect of influencing.

MR. KIRK: Well, I still say that it is not a question of McColl-Frontenac or a boot and shoe company and saying, you can't put on a broadcast about honey because we have got an economic stake in putting on a broadcast on wheat. I quite agree that if the sponsors were chosen in that way that you would not have that kind of influence, but I think the basic objection is, first of all, as Mr. Hannam and I have said, that we think there is a value in having this kind of service provided as a service, but it should not be provided as some, presumably, free service, or by a gasoline company; it is not a free service. It is a public service, and it has been developed as such and we think it should remain so. The second thing is, sponsors do have a stake; I don't say they have a stake in what is said specifically in the way of influencing opinion in a farm broadcast; I don't say Sweet Caporal cigarettes would have that, but I do say they have a stake in the broadcasts from their point of view; its listeners

audience and its degree of appeal to city-listening audience, as opposed to purely farm audiences. They have a very definite stake. They have a stake in whether or not to experiment with a brand new formula.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is perhaps a new point so far as this concerns you. You are suggesting that if one should get some stunt that works, the sponsor would be very loathe to see that changed for some other presentation.

MR. KIRK: Well, I think he would interest himself in what the proposal was.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: At the present time it seems to be CBC policy to declare a programme and then seek the sponsor, and not the other way round. They simply determine what kind of broadcast they want to put on, and then start shopping to see who will buy the programme, but they must take it as is. That is the policy, I believe.

MR. KIRK: I understand that is the principle, particularly in the television field; that is the principle being developed.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: They put up the programme they think is fit, and then say, "We will put it on as a sustaining programme if we cannot sell it", but it does not seem to affect the programme itself -- at least that is what we have been told.

MR. KIRK: Well, I would agree with the principle if you are going into television you have to have sponsorship, principally if you are selling established programmes and not selling time; I quite agree with that principle one hundred per cent. I am not altogether convinced we don't get a relationship between programme and sponsor every time.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You are a skeptic?

MR. KIRK: It seems to me that this is almost inevitable. If I had a great deal of money invested in a broadcast and my name was very closely indentified with it and it was a great success. I would think I had an investment there.

MR. COYNE: I am turning over to page 10 of your brief. You put forward a suggestion, which has to do with a Minister answering in Parliament, and you suggest that he should not be bound to answer for the CBC in Parliament, but the CBC should make its own explanations before a proper parliamentary committee. I would like to put this to you for your comments. It has been suggested that one of the great difficulties under which the CBC has laboured for many years is the incessant amount of justification and representation that they have to make to all sorts of committees and inquiries, of which this Royal Commission is one, and which, in the course of which, there have been a great many parliamentary inquiries covering a very broad range of the CBC's activities. Is it not implied in this suggestion, at least, that this present situation, if it exists, unfortunately, is

likely to be exaggerated? If the CBC is going to have to answer citizen criticism before Parliament --

MR. KIRK: It would take still more time.

MR. COYNE: Yes.

MR. KIRK: I have not thought of it particularly in that regard. I thought more of the safeguarding of this very vital principle, the divorce of CBC from Government, and I have not thought of it in that connection. I suppose this is the implication in that respect and in that way it would be a disadvantage, I guess. I dont' know.

MR. COYNE: I don't want to press you on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to ask a question at this point, as to how your suggestion would work. You say the Minister should not answer for the CBC in the House because he is the Minister and it necessarily involves him and the Government in some participation in CBC affairs, at least, it has the appearance of it, and you say it should be done entirely with the CBC officials on committees. Does it mean a committee would be almost continously in session?

MR. KIRK: Not at all, but the CBC is always there to be inquired from directly by individuals. I don't know any reason why there should be access to Parliament for all questions of proprieties, for example -- that there should be continuous access to Parliament for the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mean that members of Parliament should not ask questions of the House,

they should ask questions of the CBC people?

MR. KIRK: There need not be these facilities every day, but just on occasions.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think any questions which arise, which would come up due to certain citizen demands, have to be dealt with quickly. I think to refer to committees of the House would prove to be very unwieldy and operate to the detriment of the managers and governors of the CBC. Then, of course, there is another point. As Parliament is putting up the money, and since they are the representatives of the people, should they not have the right to inquire?

MR. KIRK: Oh, they have the right to inquire.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But through committees, I would visualize it would be quite unwieldy.

MR. KIRK: I must confess I did not think there were a great number of vital issues arising for immediate decisions to be dealt with by Parliament. I do not think that condition exists.

MR. COYNE; Would you try to differentiate in your mind between the two different issues and whether matters of policy should be drafted in Parliament or committees?

MR. KIRK: Do you mean decisions for the purpose of how you go about dealing with them?

MR. COYNE: Of course, I suspect this system as it exists today, the Minister answers certain specific questions on behalf of the CBC and matters about general policy are referred from

time to time to special parliamentary committees.

MR. KIRK: And I think for the most part it has been kept pretty clear -- the position of the Minister. There are situations that should not arise. The Estimates as they did in this last session were pretty well confused, and I think it is extremely important.

MR. COYNE: Turning to the section of your brief on financial requirements commencing on page 13, you set forth in the middle of the page several reasons why the CBC needs substantial funds, and particularly funds should be provided for good school broadcasts, and the question I should like to ask you is this, whether, in view of the fact that education, in the strict sense, at least, in the sense of operating schools, this is a provincial matter under our Constitution, whether it is not more proper that the funds for this purpose, as distinct from facilities that the CBC must necessarily provide, should not come from the provinces' Departments of Education rather than from the general coffer of Canada through the CBC?

MR. KIRK: Well, I have no objection to that suggestion at all in principle. I am inclined to feel that it would be a great deal more efficient if the CBC went ahead and produced the school broadcasts. You have the problem of organizing the thing. You have ten provinces and they will have different ideas to the extent to which they wish to utilize these broadcasts and have ideas about the broadcasts, and it strikes me as being a fairly

complicated proposition -- the organizing of these services and the financing of them through provincial funds.

MR. COYNE: I suppose there are several different aspects if you want to break it down. In the first place, the question of providing facilities for actual reproduction of the programme, technical facilities, which the CBC would have to provide. And secondly, there is the question of determining the content of the programme, which, at the moment, I think we have been advised is done by the provincial departments. Thirdly, is the question of where the funds should come from.

MR. KIRK: Well, we have not a very completely developed policy decision on this. I can point out, though, it is one of the policies of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture that some means should be found for the funds for education, but I would not say that education is the objective in principle. I do know the rural people feel there must be a valuable potential here for school broadcasting.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Do you think federal funds should be devoted at all, even to the extent of providing the physical facilities, which I don't believe would be very much? For instance, if you were a citizen of Newfoundland and no school broadcasts were being received, and as a taxpayer you contributed to school broadcasts, say in the Province of Alberta, which is a strictly provincial responsibility, and you are contributing to those

broadcasts. Even just providing the facilities and the technicians and even if the school programme is provided by the provinces, you are still paying taxes, even though it is a small amount to support the schools of another province, which is another problem. Is that the field of the federal authorities, even if the provinces are willing to do so; even if the provinces themselves take the position that the CBC should provide the facilities, do you think it is the proper field of the federal Parliament to provide them? Even though it is not a heavy charge, say only fifteen minutes a day, on communication lines, that a federal taxpayer pays, and the province does not pay, do you feel the provinces should be supported even to that extent?

MR. KIRK: Yes, I say it would be justifiable to do that. If you provide a separate programme of this nature all provinces are not going to use it in the exact proportion; I realize that.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Some would want it in all their schools so some provincial taxpayers are supporting schools of another province, and that is not their responsibility. You see, it is a very complex problem.

MR. KIRK: I am quite aware of that, but as you see the farm people have these two feelings. First of all they feel that sums for education are needed, and second, that there is a field for school broadcast services. I think I would like to see them go ahead and try it and see if, in fact, they could develop such a thing.

I realize it might not be of overwhelming importance.

MR. COYNE: One final question, Mr. Kirk; on page 15, where you are dealing with the means of providing funds, you say it is unlikely that a collection of a licence fee is the best solution, and one of the difficulties you point out in connection with the licence fee is that such a fee is expensive to collect and that the people might become indifferent to the issues of Canadian broadcasting policies, and if they were called upon to pay a special tax towards that policy it would be considered as a nuisance. I would like to ask you whether you would apply that principle to any other special tax other than the licence fee method which might be adopted?

MR. KIRK: That they might become indifferent.

MR. COYNE: No, you object to the license fee as being a special tax and you say the money should come out of a general revenue. What would be your view on the excise tax at present imposed on television and radio receivers? It is a special tax ear-marked to support the CBC.

MR. KIRK: Well I do not think the section of the public I am talking about thinks of it as a special tax for the CBC. I think people just buy their television set. That would be part of my answer to that.

MR. COYNE: In other words, there are special taxes and special taxes?

MR. KIRK: Yes, this is one that is calculated on the basis of the old radio license so that you have to go and pay, you have to take the initiative and this is where this difficulty I am referring to comes in.

MR. COYNE: Specifically you do not apply the same objection to the excise tax on receiver sets?

MR. KIRK: No, of course, there are other objections to that because of the basis it is on.

MR. COYNE: Oh, quite. That completes my questions, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to ask you one question, Mr. Kirk, on page 6 you speak of unanimity of opinion which you have had in your Federation for, I take it, some time in the field of radio

and television; would you indicate the extent to which that is a detailed unanimity of opinion? I am not questioning your brief or any part of it, but we are naturally anxious to assess the weight of the various submissions we get and you are speaking in the name of a very large number of people. Now, to what extent has there been any meetings and in the committees and your various conferences, discussion of radio and television broadcasting beyond the question of just that it is a good thing and you like to have it to the point, such as your point on the separate regulatory body, your question of exsion of services and so forth.

MR. KIRK: I think this would be a very appropriate one for Mr. Hannam to answer, his association with our Federation goes back further than mine.

MR. HANNAM: I would say that from the early days of our Federation we have supported the present system of broadcasting in Canada consistently with an overwhelming majority every time the issue arose. Now, there certainly have been views expressed that have been critical of the CBC or its programming or its methods but I would say that has been definitely a minority point of view. It is true it has not come up every year because we have not established policy on it and due to the size of Canada and the limits in the number of director's meetings we can have means we do not get into a detailed discussion

of it very often but they do in the provincial Federations. After all, our Canadian Federation is a collection of our provincial bodies. Every time there is an issue that should be considered a change of policy or a new development, something that will come up in our Federation, we will have considerable discussion on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not questioning at all the sincerity of your remarks but we have to assess the weight of the opinions you are expressing in your brief which, in fact, are held in detail throughout the constituency you speak for. Would you say that the general structure of our broadcasting system has been the subject matter of debate among the members of your organization.

MR. HANNAM: Not in detail, I would not think amongst the members although I would not be in a position to know that but I doubt if the rank and file of farm citizens any more than other citizens know many of the details of policy that your Commission is discussing, Mr. Chairman. I would certainly think that amongst the farm people it would be equally so amongst the citizens generally if not better, because they are more dependent on radio and television.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would their opinion be influenced to any degree by reason of specific programmes rather than the overall daily fare that is served up? I am thinking of Farm Forum and the farm noonday broadcasts?

MR. KIRK: No, I hardly think so because, on the other hand, you have a great many private stations and private stations in many cases can give a special community service that the bigger CBC stations cannot give. You have that influence as opposed to the influence of the CBC. You have a private interest that is sometimes much stronger and closer to the farm family than the CBC can be.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much Mr. Hannam and Mr. Kirk, we appreciate your coming here and we will consider your brief because we feel it is an important one for us to have. We will break off now for 5 minutes.

---A short recess.

RADIO-ELECTRONICS-TELEVISION MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

Appearances:

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr. J.D. Campbell | President |
| Mr. F.W. Radcliffe | General Manager |
| Mr. R.A. Hackbusch | Director of Engineering |

- - - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: We will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit No. 204. Mr. Campbell if you were here at the opening you heard our procedure. Will you be presenting the brief to us?

MR. CAMPBELL: I will, Mr. Chairman, and I would appreciate it if in the questioning period afterwards the questions could be referred to me and then I can call on my associates in the room for anything which they can contribute.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, that is quite in order.

MR. CAMPBELL: I do not intend Mr. Fowler, to read our entire brief which was submitted early in May of this year but I would like to review our recommendations in the light of the submissions that have been placed before you so far. In our brief we recommend three points for your consideration.

1. The formation of an independent regulating body.

2. Action on the introduction of colour TV in Canada.

3. The financing of the CBC on a basis

other than excise tax.

The first two are, we feel, interlocking, and I will discuss them together.

It is primarily a principle -- we feel principles are most important -- on which we base our recommendation for an independent body to regulate broadcasting in Canada. The principle is that one man as captain of one of the teams in the field cannot also both make the rules and perform as the referee, but we believe that there are also very practical problems caused by this principle not being followed.

To date, any objective observer must realize that no factual case of hardship has been proven due to an act of the CBC and that the CBC has acquitted itself well in carrying out a difficult assignment.

However, it seems to us that it is being assumed that this proves the present method of control and operation is, therefore, right and the possibilities of improvement are being overlooked.

A conscientious man, endeavouring to set the rules by which both he and others must live, may often hinder his own progress in his efforts to be impartial.

We suggest that the CBC, in attempting to do an objective and conscientious job in both the field of regulation and operation, is possibly restricting its own and other's progress as broadcasters, and if it were divorced from the regulating function it would have the opportunity of greater freedom in developing a national service.

The point that causes concern to the members of our association is the delay we experienced in the start of black and white TV in Canada, and what we feel will be a serious delay in the start of colour TV.

A steady growth in an industry generally proves best for all those involved -- the public it serves, its employees and the industry itself. The result of the delay in the start of black and white TV in Canada produced such a pent-up demand by the time it finally arrived, that the industry virtually mushroomed over night.

Due to the rapid growth in saturation we are now missing the replacement market being experienced in the U.S., and we are most concerned that the same thing will happen in colour unless action is taken quickly.

We are not critical of the technical ability of the CBC or the manner in which it runs its own operations, but we do feel that an independent regulating body would be in a position to take a more objective view, and the CBC would be freer to implement dynamic and aggressive policies to the improvement of the service it provides the public.

Our third recommendation is the elimination of the excise tax which we consider discriminatory. It can be asked, why is it discriminatory when it is entirely spent on providing service to the user of the product carrying the tax. However, there is no similar case we know of, and, of course, there

are innumerable examples of services being provided and supported from the Consolidated Revenue Account. Also, it is a basic fact of economics that the lower the price the greater the market. So, regardless of the level, there are people being denied TV for economic reasons due to this 15 per cent tax increasing the selling price.

Anticipating the question -- how should the CBC be financed -- may I offer two observations. Firstly, if a service such as the CBC is to be provided for the public, it would appear only fair that the users of that service, in this case owners of TV and radio sets, should pay directly for it. However, we do not recommend the imposing of an annual license fee because experience with radio licenses some years ago proved it was an expensive, difficult and unpopular way to raise funds for this purpose. We, therefore, believe we should recommend an annual grant from the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Secondly, in determining the amount of this grant, we suggest consideration be given to what and how much in the way of programming and service the CBC should provide that is chargeable to public revenue, and that this amount should come from Consolidated Revenue in the form of an annual grant based on so much per set in use.

To put it another way, we feel that the amount supplied to the CBC should be based on the service and programmes supplied in implementing the Massey, and this Commission's recommendations, and

not just based on what it costs to run the CBC which, in much of its operation, is simply operating a commercial venture, particularly since from the number of applications for licenses, it is apparent there is sufficient private capital willing to enter this field.

I shall be pleased, gentlemen, to try and answer any questions, or amplify my remarks wherever I can.

That is a brief summary Mr. Chairman of our recommendations and I will be glad to try and answer your questions if you would care to put them to me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we have read your brief, and I think that is a very adequate summary Mr. Campbell. Mr. Coyne, are you taking this?

MR. COYNE: Yes I am sir. I have no particular questions on the foreword and your description of the industry and how it is developed but I would like to turn to page 7 of your brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave the introductory section I have one question. Mr. Campbell, on page 2 you say reactionary changes in regulations relating to the foregoing could have serious effects upon the livelihood of the approximately 25,000 production workers currently employed in the Canadian electronics industry. What do you mean when you say the reactionary changes in regulations relating to the foregoing?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well such things, and this

does not apply necessarily to the CBC of course, but tax changes we have had, or any change in the technical aspects of the broadcast regulations that might change the channels, the technical aspects; we have had, Mr. Chairman, as you will realize, many changes in the tax structure, I think there were some eight changes in tax in 10 years, which is not very conducive to good operations from the business point of view.

THE CHAIRMAN: So that when you are using the word "regulations" you are using it not in the narrow sense that we have been using, the regulations regarding broadcasting.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, we are using it in the broader sense.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good.

MR. COYNE: Turning now to page 7 Mr. Campbell, the section on regulation of sound and television broadcasting in Canada in the second paragraph you say, "However, this association is not opposed to government sponsored broadcasting in the interests of public service and development provided such activities do not infringe on the rightful activities of private enterprise carried on with an ethical respect for the public interest." I wonder if you could expand a little on what you regard as rightful activities of private enterprise in the broadcasting field?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. Generally speaking, what we are referring to here Mr. Coyne is the right of free enterprise, to risk your own investment capital

in such manner and in those areas in which they so desire. In other words to use an example, which has been discussed before this Commission, let us say if independents wanted to form a network, they should be so permitted to do, and if they want to risk their own money in doing it, they should be permitted to do so, even though they may lose that money.

MR. COYNE: In other words you pose the right of private enterprise to enter any field and you say that this is no different from any other field.

MR. CAMPBELL: Would you mind repeating that question?

MR. COYNE: You put forward or you use the term "right of private enterprise" to enter this field.

MR. CAMPBELL: Right, that is true.

MR. COYNE: And you say it is no different from any other field?

MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Campbell, it is not quite as simple as that is it? I can see the argument that if a man wanted to risk his own money he should be allowed to risk it, but if in the process of risking it, there may be an impact on the public interest under the existing system, don't you think that we as Canadians have to look at that? This term of private enterprise is not quite as untramelled as you suggest.

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't suppose that there is any subject that we could bring up Mr. Chairman, that is completely untramelled, but there still is

that principle. You could go further and ask the question if there is sufficient private capital for the kind of thing we are talking about, should there be a public one? We of course do not oppose the public one. We think they have done a job and done that job well and it is necessary for a country such as ours, but there are still many areas in which private enterprise could have greater freedom than it now apparently possesses.

MR. COYNE: Just following that through for a moment as a specific instance, take the school system. I suppose you put forward that private enterprise has a right to operate schools, and of course they do operate schools to some extent.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. COYNE: But surely, no one would suggest that was a right which they were entitled to exercise in any way to the detriment of the general public interest in publicly supported schools.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think probably you are conjecturing pretty far in saying that. I think you would have to agree that you could not carry the concept of private enterprise to the point that it did harm to the public as a whole. With respect to the suggestion you have made there are no limitations that I know of on schools, provided certain standards are met, and no harm has been done that I know about.

MR. COYNE: On the other hand there is perhaps what one might call a central body for both

public and private schools in each province which also dictates what the private schools are going to teach and generally regulates their activity.

THE CHAIRMAN: They determine the programme content so to speak.

MR. CAMPBELL: They set the standard of education, which becomes the provincial standard and which has been generally accepted by all further seats of learning such as universities and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN: That must be.

MR. CAMPBELL: That must be?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well -- must it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well if you are going to start a private school, a boy's school for instance, you have to comply with the public requirement of standards and content of education?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, up to that stage. But beyond that stage you could start a university and have any requirements for entrance which you like, not necessarily the provincial standard.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well I was talking about boys' schools.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well you have got a case there. You have a similar example there, but of course public schools are by far the majority, are they not?

MR. COYNE: As a matter of fact, yes. But wouldn't you agree that it is possible, and

we are speaking in terms of principle here --

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. COYNE: To analogize - if one takes the particular view of broadcasting as being essential to the public service, then would you not agree that it is possible to draw an analogy between the sphere of broadcasting and the sphere of education.

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't quite, because I believe that one is infinitely more commercial in nature than the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well let us take another example which we have had put to us many times, and that is the analogy of the railroad. Do you think that the rights of private enterprise or the rightful activities of private enterprise would allow anyone to wander around and start up a railroad any place they wanted?

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh no, no, obviously this must be regulated Mr. Fowler. If we have given that impression that anyone who wants to start a television station just simply erects an antenna and starts to broadcast or telecast, that is not what we meant at all. There must be control over the whole, but we do think that the control might be carried out by an impartial body and both the CBC and the private broadcasters would be under the same set of regulations.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Campbell, just to pursue that for a moment, can you really in any sense at all talk about the rightful activities of private enterprise?

It might be right and proper for private enterprise to operate in some spheres or through some form of activity, but can you really say that there are such things as rightful activities?

MR. CAMPBELL: I believe so Mr. Coyne, yes. I think there are rightful activities, providing it is not to the detriment of the public or not against the public good, but I think they are definitely rights of private enterprise. I think the principle of democracy is based on the rights of the individual.

MR. COYNE: Yes, but your qualification perhaps answered the question.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, it must not be to the detriment of the good of the nation.

MR. COYNE: So that the question really resolves down to a somewhat different level as to what is the best system for operating broadcasting in the public interest?

MR. CAMPBELL: Right, I will go along with that.

MR. COYNE: Just going along to the next paragraph you say:

> "There is no doubt that the development of television broadcasting, for instance, was unnaturally retarded by the authorities responsible for the policies controlling broadcasting in Canada."

My question is, are you referring there to the CBC or to the authorities responsible for the policies in Canada, which I don't think is the CBC?

MR. CAMPBELL: Perhaps not. I am going back, of course, to the era of 1949-1950, when undoubtedly there could have been television stations put up in Canada, and which were not put up until the CBC started in 1952.

THE CHAIRMAN: But that was a Government decision.

MR. CAMPBELL: A Government decision -- whosever decision it was we feel it unnaturally retarded the television that could have been in

Canada earlier.

THE CHAIRMAN: You use that example, and you also apply the same thinking to the introduction of colour television, which is largely a governmental decision, I would assume, and you would seem to be making this as a basis for having a separate regulatory body, and my question is, what has a separate regulatory body to do with this retarding of the start of television in Canada?

MR. CAMPBELL: Simply on the principle that we feel that someone who is not directly associated with the operation could -- and we feel possibly would -- take a more objective view. In other words, I don't see why television had to be held back until 1952 even to implement the policy of a regulative role.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will agree you can argue that as to whether or not it should have been started in 1949 or that we should have waited until 1951/1952 to get started, and you can argue it would have been nice to have it start in 1949, but where this decision was a governmental decision, how could it possibly have been influenced in any way, shape or form by an independent regulatory body, or, put it another way, what possible reason was there for the publicly constituted Board of Governors, representing all of Canada, of the CBC to hold out the introduction of television in Canada when an independent regulatory body would have gone ahead faster?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I am saying, of course, that that Board of Governors, whom I take it

from what you say make the final decision or recommendation to the Government for their decision, was obviously advised by CBC who were an operating unit. Had that been advice by people completely disassociated with that, representing industry and commerce and the various arts, that recommendation to the Government could have been different.

THE CHAIRMAN: What I am trying to get into my mind is, suppose you had had your independent regulatory body existing in 1945 and from there on, what was there about the CBC decision which made them hold back, where an independent regulatory body might have gone forward?

MR. CAMPBELL: I can't tell you what there was; I don't know what the CBC's thinking or reasoning was, but I do say that other people, entirely independent from the broadcasting business, could readily have said that the CBC had no intention of putting a station in Hamilton, and there is no reason why an independent privately owned station could not start in Hamilton in 1948 if some private capital wished to go in there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you saying any more than that you got a decision which you did not like but you may have got a different decision from somebody else?

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't think that is quite the way to put it. I think that a decision from a group that we feel would be more representative of all the facets of it would have instituted telecasting in Canada earlier.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you saying that the CBC Board of Governors as presently constituted is not fully representative?

MR. CAMPBELL: Let me put it this way: I think you are pinning me down on the question, and I don't think, as representatives, I would like to see the regulatory body I have in mind like that, no.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: On the basis there is no technical ability amongst those?

MR. CAMPBELL: That there are not all facets of the people concerned represented to the degree they may be.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I think you have got to bring it down to narrower limits than that, because -- "representative of all people concerned" -- well, the whole public of Canada is concerned, and if we are going to have representation on a broader scale, as your line would indicate, you would have a very unwieldy thing. But in your first statement , when you said it was not sufficiently representative, you had in mind the technical ability?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I feel that.

THE CHAIRMAN: If you are asking for representations of the wishes and intent of the people of Canada, what better agency can you get for that representation than the Parliament of Canada?

MR. CAMPBELL: A very good statement, Mr. Fowler, and I quite subscribe to it, except that Parliament is still working on advice from

groups, one of which is the CBC, which is an operating group.

THE CHAIRMAN: And one of which should be you?

MR. CAMPBELL: Very definitely, and I think there should be others as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: But surely the national decision which when it starts out, it is a national decision which you want made by the people of Canada, and where on earth can you go better than to the Parliament of Canada, and if you are unable to convince the parliamentarians of Canada that it is better to start television earlier, then, should you start it earlier?

MR. CAMPBELL: I cannot argue against the principle that Parliament is a good place to start, but you can't expect them to know all the facets. You should have a body that recommends to Parliament, and when we have that, the better results you will get.

THE CHAIRMAN: Aren't you really denying your principle when you suggest it should be done by an independent body, because obviously you can't get all the interests represented on an independent body, but you do get it in Parliament?

MR. CAMPBELL: Could I ask you a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am not sure I will answer it.

MR. CAMPBELL: What harm would there be, or would there be any bad feature of having telecasting start in Canada in 1948?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I won't try to answer the question completely, but there have been representations to us, and we are only putting this to you to get your views, that it was a good thing to avoid some of the distorted and perhaps spot development that took place in radio, to avoid that in television, and that it was better to start out on a national basis than to start higgledy-piggledy all over the place. That is the argument that is put to us. I don't know whether it is a good argument or a bad one, but that is the theory that has been put to us.

MR. CAMPBELL: We are dealing in an area where opinion on everything is very great.

MR. COYNE: Surely, Mr. Campbell, your objection is to the policy which was adopted, and that policy was adopted, as I understand it, by the Government of Canada.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. COYNE: What I haven't been able to get clear from the course of the discussion is, what possible difference it could make to the policy decision taken by the Government of Canada if you have a CBC Board of Governors, as presently constituted, or some other board that is concerned with making and enforcing regulations -- not policy in this licensing sphere -- but regulations? And the same question comes up with regard to the present single channel policy: if the Government refused to license more than a single station in any area, what difference does it make which board

you have, or, alternately, if the Government decides the single channel policy is to be abandoned, then cannot the CBC Board of Governors grant licences to second stations just as much as an independent body?

MR. CAMPBELL: They could, yes, but we still contend that an independent regulatory body which has no direct association with the CBC, that there is the greater opportunity of a completely objective viewpoint. We also have suggested here that the CBC could be restricting itself in assuming and taking on the responsibility of looking after the interests of both the publicly owned operations part and the private part.

THE CHAIRMAN: What do you mean by the completely objective view?

MR. CAMPBELL: One on which a decision can be made which does not affect the other facet of the work which is the operating part.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you think an independent regulatory body charged by the Government of Canada with the control of broadcasting in Canada could ignore the interests of the publicly owned system?

MR. CAMPBELL: No, no-one suggested it should be ignored. It certainly should not, but it may get a better balance.

THE CHAIRMAN: Better balance between what?

MR. CAMPBELL: Public and private.

MR. COYNE: But surely the interest really at stake here, and that any Board is concerned with,

is not the interest of a public or private system, as operators or business men, but we are supposed to be interested in the general public and the listening public.

MR. CAMPBELL: All right. If you want to use "general public" in the broad sense, then it does include the private broadcaster or the manufacturer.

MR. COYNE: Oh, absolutely -- quite right.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I still come back to this phrase "a more objective body"; it might be a less well-informed body, but more objective in what -- objective in what respect? Objective in that it does not look to the needs of the national system?

MR. CAMPBELL: No; not unduly influenced. In other words, gets a balanced viewpoint between all three -- the public, private capital and the publicly owned part; or, in other words, the public as a whole.

THE CHAIRMAN: But isn't that the function of the Government? Isn't that the job of Government to decide?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, but again I go back to what I said, that certainly the Government defines the policy, but I am talking about who recommends the policy to the Government for their consideration.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody has got access to the Government. If you have got a better argument to put up than the CBC has, can't you convince the Government?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: A separate regulatory body would not be a policy-making board.

MR. CAMPBELL: Why not?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: By its name it would not be a policy-making board. It is there to enforce the regulations and make what regulations it thinks are necessary for whatever purposes they are set up for, but they are a regulating board and not a policy-making board -- on the basis of the name we are using.

MR. CAMPBELL: Do you mean that policy is set by the Government?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: But there is no question that the Government's policy is a decision heavily weighted by the decision of the regulating board.

THE CHAIRMAN: Aren't you really saying that questions of policy in the field of radio and television ought to be transferred from Parliament and vested in a separate regulatory board?

MR. CAMPBELL: No, we are not saying that at all. There is obviously in a thing like television and radio broadcasting -- there obviously has to be overall regulation in the country -- technically -- are you talking technically, or about programmes?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am talking about the decision to start television.

MR. CAMPBELL: Technically, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In 1949, when you would have liked to have seen television start, we had a

Board composed of ten men elected to represent the public interest across Canada on the Board of Governors of the CBC, drawn from various walks of life for various reasons.

MR. CAMPBELL: Were there any members interested in the private broadcasting field, or manufacturers?

THE CHAIRMAN: They must not be.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That is in the Act.

THE CHAIRMAN: These are representatives of public opinion of Canada, and you also have a Parliament in existence which is supposed to be able to draw upon public opinion and reflect it, and that body decided it would not start television until 1951/1952. Supposing you have an independent regulatory body which you ask for, also drawn from all parts of Canada ---

MR. CAMPBELL: Which would not necessarily be restricted to people who have no interest.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, if that is your recommendation, I can understand it, but at the moment there is some thought that you would rather not have somebody on a regulatory body who has got a personal interest.

MR. CAMPBELL: True enough, but haven't you got that in the CBC today? You have the CBC making decisions, and they are in the position you are describing.

THE CHAIRMAN: But they are owned by the people.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, but we are talking

about the CBC as a group of people. I am not suggesting there is any personal interest but, notwithstanding, they have an interest in operating as well as putting regulations out which would affect others who are not owned by the population.

THE CHAIRMAN: What was their interest in 1949 in not starting television?

MR. CAMPBELL: I have been wondering Mr. Fowler, I don't know.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to know if you are making the suggestion they had some interest.

MR. CAMPBELL: I can only assume they had, because they did not permit it to start, but I don't know what those interests were.

MR. COYNE: Taking the question of this regulatory board, Mr. Campbell, do you really think of it in terms of being a type of board in which various persons interested in the manufacture of sets or the ownership of private stations or the operation of public stations, if you like, are to be presented. Is that the board that is going to protect the public interest of Canada -- the licensed public.

MR. CAMPBELL: Are you talking about the technical part or the programme part?

MR. COYNE: I am asking you whether you can help us? If you can develop that; if you can envisage how this board would be constituted -- who would be its members.

MR. CAMPBELL: First of all I think you have to know what the board would cover. There are two interests. What I call the technical, such as how many stations there are and the allocation of channel frequencies. That is the kind of thing. Then there is the actual programme.

MR. COYNE: If I might just interject there, as far as the allocation of frequencies is concerned, any large measure of policy respecting those technical matters, at the moment, resides in the Department of Transport and there it is necessary --

MR. CAMPBELL: Very definitely.

MR. COYNE: Because the government already has international treaties and so forth.

MR. CAMPBELL: There is no question about that, that there must be that kind of control in the country. We think, perhaps, more of that could go into the Department of Transport, this regulating body would be more on the programme content; the type of programme and the kind of programme, hours and commercials. We would think the real public interest lies there and that body could be represented by all facets of the public, as well as that segment of the public concerned with the physical part of producing and broadcasting and the manufacturing of sets and so forth.

MR. COYNE: The programme content.

MR. CAMPBELL: There could be an overlap between those two and the technical aspect. Such as, is there sufficient commercial revenue to start a second station in another place, and if they are in touch with programming they are in a better position to advise generally.

MR. COYNE: But really, surely the justification for appointing people of that kind to the board is not because they are really

representative of the general public interest because they are representative of some special interest which might come within the purview of that board.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, if I may qualify, in a group you make up that way you get a representation of this segment and that segment and you know it to be a representation as a whole.

MR. COYNE: I am not sure I agree with you on that. In other words you are suggesting that if you get a large enough group of various private interests, taking them together collectively, you say they are representative of the public interest.

MR. CAMPBELL: Are you assuming --

MR. COYNE: I am not assuming anything, I am just trying to elicit your point of view.

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask you this question, if you are not assuming are you inferring that private interests do not have public interests.

MR. COYNE: Not specially.

MR. CAMPBELL: So the fact that a man who sits on the board has private interests does not mean that that person does not have public interest.

MR. COYNE: Oh no.

THE CHAIRMAN: These suggestions from the representations made to us along the lines you are doing, we would need quite a Board if they are to represent separate interests at all. We want educaters, and women's groups, and religious groups, and everybody wants representation on the Board of

Governors to represent a special interest.

MR. CAMPBELL: No doubt that would be a very major problem and no doubt there is that problem in choosing the ten so it would be that much harder selecting 20 to get this overall representation.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think there is a hall in Ottawa big enough to hold them all.

MR. CAMPBELL: But, I think a representation of 20 would be a much better representation than 10.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the purpose of the point is whether or not you appoint people representing the people's interest or whether you appoint people representing the general public. We feel there has to be some of that detail to get a true representation. After all, I think it is safe, on my part, to assume that in general a great deal of TV and radio, if we are to get a complete coverage and particularly, a technical programme across the country, a great portion of it is going to be supported commercially and if you get into that area and, to use the word "commercial", particularly commercial interests, they will have something to contribute to such body as we suggest.

MR. COYNE: Just one question, Mr. Campbell, arising out of the point you make and the distinction between technical questions and programme questions. Would this sort of an arrangement be consistent with that thinking that in the technical sphere there are particular private interests, or particular interests of various kinds involved? For example, if someone

is operating a radio station and someone else applies for a license to operate a station somewhere else on the same channel, the interests of the first station are directly affected. It may be true of a number of technical problems of this nature, whereas on the other hand where there are general overall policies of programme, why should the general public care for a minute what the views are of a private station operator.

MR. CAMPBELL: Let us take for a moment all the private station operators. In other words, it could be a representative of the industry of independent operators rather than an independent operator.

MR. COYNE: Really, we have been asking you as to your ideas as to the constitution of this body. Really, what you have in mind is a body of large specific interests such as the ones you have spoken of, which would be directly representative of it. And the public is one specific interest -- the public at large.

The public at large, plus a certain number of private interests.

MR. CAMPBELL: We are here, of course, representing a group of private interests, and I do not try to side-step that for one moment. But I cannot at all consider that because a man has private interests he does not have public interests. I cannot consider that at all. If the ten people already representing the public have greater individual knowledge of different fadets of the

particular realm of broadcasting, I mean manufacturing and so on, I don't think that board would be weakened at all, either in its representations to the public or its representations to the government.

MR. COYNE: One other question on page 8, the paragraph beginning in the middle of the page. You say this policy, which I take it to be referring to the single channel policy on television, is in contradiction to the policy of the government. I would just like to know if you would care to explain that or qualify that statement?

MR. CAMPBELL: At 11.00 o'clock last night when I was reading the brief I marked that paragraph with an "X" and made myself a bet that that would be one of the questions you would ask. What we mean there is, that the government, basically, supports free enterprise in competition as against control within an industry as we have what is the Combines Act and so on. That is what we mean by government policy.

MR. COYNE: You are not suggesting the policy of just licensing one station is not the policy adopted by the station?

MR. CAMPBELL: Not at all.

THE CHAIRMAN: Private interests have a great deal of control and a great deal of latitude and we are living under a system in which there are various governmental activities --

MR. CAMPBELL: It is a matter of relativity. Everybody would like to operate with no regulations.

THE CHAIRMAN: They would like regulations for everybody but themselves.

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't doubt it.

MR. COYNE: There is just one point, you are talking about the start of television and you say in your short memorandum and brief, it has had a bad effect on your group by reason of the fact that the replacements which will now be coming up are not coming up because of the delay in starting the TV system. I can understand that from your point of view, but you do make the point that the earlier sets were 10 and 12-inch sets and they moved more rapidly into the 21-inch sets -- isn't there another interest here? What you are really saying is that the public has been saved from the necessity of replacing the 10 and 12-inch sets?

MR. CAMPBELL: That is a question of economics, but let me turn the question back to you on that basis shouldn't we hold up production of automobiles until we get automobiles that will get 100 gallons to the mile. Why don't we hold up the manufacture of television until we get colour?

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think that anyone thought we would get 21-inch sets so quickly. But it did save people from buying 12 and 14-inch sets.

MR. CAMPBELL: I question that economically, but I think anything that holds up progress or development of industry is not good for the public at large. We employ a great many people. We provide a lot of the income of the country as a whole. I think that is definitely in the public interest.

THE CHAIRMAN: As it has worked out in the last four years, you have had a good opportunity to provide a good deal of that income.

MR. CAMPBELL: We have. And because of that it has curved down this year, and because of that this was bound to happen sooner or later.

That, again, is perhaps questionable. If you look at the radio industry which has been in business so long, I think we have virtually reached a saturation point of 100 per cent and the radio business is still going on.

MR. COYNE: The more direct comparison would be, what is the curve of television sets in the United States, did it reach a peak a few years ago and has it dropped off since?

MR. CAMPBELL: They did one year, one year they did have a slight drop-off, it was in 1950 -- no, 1951 following the start of Korea but since then it has climbed ahead.

MR. COYNE: Climbing up again?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I think we show some figures in here having to do with the United States superimposed on ours.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Was not the introduction of television in this country due to economic factors? That is, the government in their wisdom decided to delay the initiation of this until such time as the errors and mistakes could be found out and they allowed a wealthier neighbour to the south to develop it to that point. If that were the case was that not at least partially in the public interest?

MR. CAMPBELL: Have all the errors been found now?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I do not know but it is a matter of relativity?

MR. CAMPBELL: I agree.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we discovered the error of the 10-inch set.

MR. CAMPBELL: It is coming back now.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Where does public interest lie?

MR. CAMPBELL: That is a question I would rather not answer, it is a question I cannot answer and I do not think anybody can but I do believe in letting things take their natural evolution to the largest degree possible.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You see, we suffer from affinity to the United States. In Australia and Great Britain and other places the same objection has not been raised to the lack of these facilities, they prefer to sit back and let someone else pay for the mistakes and benefit from them.

MR. CAMPBELL: You are referring to Australia?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Not England, of course, it started ahead of Canada.

THE CHAIRMAN: But in the matter of colour that could happen in England, they could say that it was a very expensive medium and they were going to wait until the agony was over.

MR. CAMPBELL: Where it is entirely public funds but here there are sufficient private funds to bring it about. I am talking about broadcasting in general, not necessarily colour but there has been sufficient capital apparently available from the

number of licenses that have been applied for, it seems to me there is enough capital to provide --

THE CHAIRMAN: Just on this question of volume of sets and so forth, you are in this business, do you envisage the development in television sets that are somewhat similar to the development which has taken place in motor cars whereby new models or new device or improvements will lead to a fairly regular turn-over of sets or are you getting into a different phase of this business?

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, undoubtedly, no question about it. Any product that is as highly a technical article as motor cars and television sets, I cannot name to you many of the things that are going to happen in the next five years, I do not think anybody else can just at the moment but there are technological advances that will turn that over.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Even styling?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, to a great extent that has taken place.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That has taken place to a certain extent in radio?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, that is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: So this dip down that has taken place now may be a dip down similar to the thing that happened in the States? It might move up?

MR. CAMPBELL: No, because the one that happened in the States happened generally in the whole economic level of the States.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us say you have a virtual saturation at the present time of television sets, if this notion of frequent replacements to get into new models were to take place that might start the curve up again, might it?

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh yes, it would, and it will undoubtedly but if we regard it by any means, technological advances from now to the innovation of colour, it can disturb us.

MR. COYNE: This is a rather general point, on page 9 you point out what you regard as a danger and you say:

> "It is emphasized that if the television channels allocated to Canada are not used, or at least the strategically located channels are not utilized, some of these may possibly be lost to United States interests."

It has been put to us before that because of our present structure there are not enough television sets in Canada, there are not as many as there should be. Now, I just put this to you; people appeared before us in Montreal last week, I think one of your members and filed a chart with the Commission which showed there were 359 television stations in the United States against 36 in Canada which is a ratio of almost exactly one to ten. Can it really be inferred from figures of that kind that we have not got as many television

stations in Canada as one would normally expect?

MR. CAMPBELL: I think so. I frankly compliment you on the way you put that question because it makes it difficult to answer.

MR. COYNE: With respect, I am doing that quite deliberately, and I hope you will not be offended.

MR. CAMPBELL: I am not offended at all.

MR. COYNE: Because your answer should be all the more useful.

MR. CAMPBELL: But I think you have to look at it this way; let us assume there were only one million people in Canada as against 15 million which would bring that ratio far, far down. I do not see why a million people, if they are willing to support it, should not have the choice of three programmes instead of one. I do not think that this is necessarily a case where we should draw a comparison.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You say the comparison should be based on area rather than population?

MR. CAMPBELL: To a certain extent but I think what settles it is, what is the demand? In other words, do people want more programmes, more stations to look at and can they be supported and I do not think there is any question today that certainly in the larger areas that additional stations can be supported on a commercial basis. Advertisers who want to buy time from the CBC at the time they want, many of them have difficulty in obtaining it.

MR. COYNE: Then, in the next paragraph you are talking about satellite stations and you say:

"The satellite stations could then retransmit television broadcasts over a much wider area than that now covered, and would bring Canadian television broadcasts to more Canadians. About 50 such stations are envisaged ..."

Have you worked out any plan, any specific plan of this kind or do you know of any plans?

MR. CAMPBELL: No, I do not know of any. We certainly have not worked any out but what we are really talking about there is a possible coverage that could be made on the channels available. I do not know if this is quite a correct thing to say but when the Ottawa station originally started I think for a period of time it did not originate programmes but simply picked up the network and rebroadcast in the Ottawa area. It is that kind of thing we are talking about in order to give as wide a coverage in the national interest for Canadians as a whole as possible.

MR. COYNE: And I suppose at a considerably less expense?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, considerably.

MR. COYNE: Than for setting up broadcasting facilities?

MR. CAMPBELL: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Well then, turning to your second point about national colour television, on page 14 you suggest there is at present a microwave network to Buffalo and that in so far as colour

programmes are available in Buffalo they can be carried on that network and you say:

> "It has been estimated that for approximately $40,000 an existing black and white transmitter can be modified to send out colour programmes flowing into that station from an already colour corrected microwave line."

The $40,000 does not mean very much to me, I do not suppose you suggest for that expenditure of money colour programmes could be brought in to the Windsor, Toronto, Ottawa, Quebec markets?

MR. CAMPBELL: Per station we are talking about.

MR. COYNE: Are there any adjustments to the microwave line that are necessary?

MR. CAMPBELL: I understand that is now being colour balanced and will be installed.

MR. COYNE: It is being done?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, it is being installed.

MR. COYNE: By the owners of the microwave system?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, the Bell Telephone.

MR. COYNE: Well, I think your point in connection with colour is quite clear, but if I may just summarize it to make sure that I am correct; your suggestion is that colour should be introduced as soon as possible on this initial basis?

MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

MR. COYNE: In order to ensure that there is some incentive to the manufacturers to get into

the production of colour sets to create a mass market and bring down the price?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, that is right. It is a chicken and egg story, if you hold up colour telecasting until you have $100 sets or you get $100 sets only when you have colour telecasting and there must be programmes available to sell the sets.

MR. COYNE: And the point made by the manufacturers is that in order to develop this, to start it in a small way and get it going?

MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

MR. COYNE: From the manufacturing point of view you would not approve of any suggestion that it be held up until the whole of the country may be blanketed with coloured programmes?

MR. CAMPBELL: We do not see any reason why it should be, no. I do not think that the people in Victoria gain anything by the people in Toronto being denied colour.

MR. COYNE: And your other point, of course, is that it is a relatively modest expenditure that is necessary in order to start out this programming that you suggest?

MR. CAMPBELL: That is right, and you realize that many of the programmes currently being brought in in black and white are transmitted in colour so it would be simply providing a lot of the programmes we now see, in colour.

MR. COYNE: Well then, I would like to pass on, Mr. Campbell, to your third point on the

excise tax. I just want to ask you two or three specific question on it because I think your point is clear but at the bottom of page 18, the last sentence, you say:

> "The sale of instruments of public enlightenment and news dissemination should be encouraged, not retarded. There is no more justification for special excise taxes on radios and television receivers than there would be on newspapers."

This is a very general statement and I would just like to test you on that. Surely, where the excise taxes are paying for something that goes over the radio and television receivers, there is at least some more justification for an outside tax on that receiver than there would be on a newspaper.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, I would have to agree with you on that point. The point we are trying to bring out here is that as a means of communication and dissemination of information, that there is no reason to tax that means of communication any more than another, but I don't dispute the fact that there is less objection when the money is applied to the benefit of those utilizing it.

THE CHAIRMAN: A sort of pre-payment payment of service?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, it is a pre-payment of service.

MR. COYNE: Well, then, this is a small point, but in the second sentence on the page, you say --

> "The idea of pinpointing the tax dollars collected from one group of products for a specific purpose was unique in the history of taxation, but, even if the reason was logical at that time, the argument is no longer valid."

I would suggest to you that it is really not quite as you make it out to be. I think it is a fact that the original gasoline tax actually, whenever it was imposed, was originally justified for the purpose of

raising moneys to pay for the building and maintaining of highways, which is perhaps the same principle.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And of course there are other examples.

MR. CAMPBELL: But was the gasoline tax when it was imposed actually handed over to a board to build and maintain highways?

THE CHAIRMAN: Some people argue it should be.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. COYNE: I couldn't say.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think there is a difference between the paying of the tax in the first instance and the actual practical application and use of it.

MR. COYNE: Yes, the practical application of it -- it is certainly at the present time not sustaining the original principle.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, I wouldn't know of any tax where the tax that was actually collected was turned over to a board to use for the justification that it was based on.

MR. COYNE: On the following page, No. 20, you say:

> "The electronics industry is being discriminated against in the continued imposition of the 15 per cent excise tax because this tax has already been removed from electrical appliances, household stoves and refrigerators,

cameras, films, luggage and miscellaneous consumer goods, etc."

Generally, your statement is that it is unfair for one aspect of the proposition in that the manufacture and sales of receivers to some extent has been reduced ---

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

MR. COYNE: --- by reason of the nature of this tax, and I would just like to put this to you: is it not true that the manufacture and sale of your sets have been greatly stimulated by reason of the expenditure of those taxes on television services extending across the country, which give life to the demand for television sets?

MR. CAMPBELL: No question about it, Mr. Coyne -- no question about it at all -- except that a lot of the services provided by the telecaster should have been allowed to come on earlier. There is no question that the service provided by the CBC has provided, shall we say, the chicken that laid the egg for a lot of TV sets to be sold.

MR. COYNE: And I suppose you would agree that it certainly would not be in your interests as manufacturers of television receivers, let us say, if the CBC television service should be cut to half or one-quarter?

MR. CAMPBELL: No.

MR. COYNE: What you are really complaining about is, not that this money is being spent on broadcasting, but that it is obtained by a tax on receivers instead of out of the general revenue?

MR. CAMPBELL: I would just like to point

out that we are not complaining as much as we are suggesting that there are improved ways of doing a good job better. There is not too much complaint in this brief. We are pointing out that even that job that is being done could be improved upon.

MR. COYNE: What really amounts to an aside on this question -- we are having surprisingly little criticism of the excise tax from the whole host of consumer interests; private individuals who have come before us. In fact we have made a point pretty well of asking them ---

MR. CAMPBELL: I noticed that this morning.

MR. COYNE: Whether this excise tax is something that is iniquitous or whether they object to it, and the answer has largely been no.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I wonder how many people know it is there.

MR. COYNE: That may be the answer; in other words, you are suggesting it is not really noticeable to the public?

MR. CAMPBELL: No. There have, in fact, been many surveys of public opinion -- which I am not free to discuss this morning -- but I am sure if you go out and take a poll of the people and ask them this: "Is there any excise tax on your TV set -- how much are you paying for it -- what do you pay on your set to get it" -- I think you would be astounded at the lack of knowledge. In other words, it is a "buried" tax.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Could you give us any figure at all on the amount of sales

resistance there is, because of this excise tax?

MR. CAMPBELL: I don't think I can, Mr. Stewart. I am afraid I would have to take it on a question of basic economics. In other words, if you reduce the cost you do broaden your markets. Now, we are getting up in the area of saturation where it becomes essential that the market is as broad as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: It must be pretty broad now, is it not?

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, of the homes in the whole of Canada about fifty-five per cent today have television, and that is to say those who are within the range of a station -- about two million sets in the homes of Canada.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: In Appendix A, Mr. Campbell, where you have the production of radios in Canada from 1925 to 1955 -- a period of thirty years -- and television from 1948 to 1955, I see that the past five or six years, around 1950, the sales have been in the vicinity of seven hundred to eight hundred thousand; in 1955 it was 572,000. Do you know what at present is the number of radios in Canada?

MR. CAMPBELL: The number of radios, sir?

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Perhaps the number of Canadian homes equipped with radios would be a better way of putting it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes. Well, if you work with the figures as we now have them, what is it 3,800,000 or 3,900,00 homes in Canada -- that

would be around four million homes in Canada, there is literally complete saturation, and there is considerably over one set per home on the average. I believe it is one and a half sets per home, so that would be approximately six million, anyway. And then of course you have your automobiles after that.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That does not include the automobiles?

MR. CAMPBELL: No. When I say six million in the homes I mean not including automobiles.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: The number of sets is not so important as the number of homes; what would the percentage be on those homes equipped with short wave receivers? What has been the sale of short wave receivers in Canada, on the average?

MR. CAMPBELL: In later years, very slight. The peak years for the short wave was in the late twenties and then a little in the middle or late forties. There have been very few short wave sales since that time.

MR. RADCLIFFE: There is very little, but there has been a little interest in short wave sales in the last year or two due to the new Canadian wanting to get his homeland in his own language. That has been a small portion, but it is still a very small average.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: So that the old Canadian has been satisfied with his range of frequency, since he can get his local or possibly the American programmes?

MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But do you see any technical difficulty either in providing short wave broadcasts in Canada of Canadian programmes; in other words, would it be difficult to receive all over Canada programmes of a domestic nature, or is there some other difficulty in the way?

MR. CAMPBELL: Might I ask you a question before answering that? Are you asking the question with respect to getting additional channels or being able to centralize your broadcasts?

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: With respect to centralizing the broadcasts. In other words, being able to reach more people with fewer facilities.

MR. CAMPBELL: Would you like to answer this, Mr. Radcliffe -- about the technical difficulties?

MR. RADCLIFFE: We should go long wave -- if we are going to do it -- not short wave.

THE CHAIRMAN: Long wave?

MR. RADCLIFFE: Yes, you would have to go long wave if you want to have a central broadcasting system to cover large areas in Canada. You should have a long wave broadcast transmitter.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Are these transmitters more expensive?

MR. RADCLIFFE: I am afraid I couldn't answer that.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: More expensive than the short wave -- you don't know?

MR. RADCLIFFE: No. The antenna system would be more expensive for long wave

systems.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is this because you think the reception would be better on the long wave than the short wave?

MR. RADCLIFFE: Better coverage.

MR. COYNE: You lose, of course, the local station if you centralize it to a greater degree, don't you?

MR. CAMPBELL: You lose the local effect of the station.

MR. COYNE: Oh, yes, this is more directed towards getting the coverage in areas which are very hard to reach by local stations.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have only one question I would like to ask: you say something about importation from the United States, and I think you are complaining about travellers who go to the United States and bring back sets, particularly the new small ones?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In their $100 allowance?

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: What has happened to your principle of rightful activities of the private enterpriser?

MR. CAMPBELL: How do you mean that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, haven't I got any right of private enterprise to go and buy sets if I want to?

MR. CAMPBELL: Oh, yes, but all we would

like is that the private enterpriser be given an equal chance to compete. We can compete with a tariff -- because that is simply a margin to give you some protection on your manufacturing cost, but there is no way you can compete against a tax of 15 per cent which is imposed on your product, and not on one coming across the border. We can compete any day with an ordinary import, but there is no excise tax on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then it is the added 15 per cent you are concerned about?

MR. CAMPBELL: Right.

THE CHAIRMAN: We are very much obliged to you for your brief and the presentation thereof and the questions which you have answered.

I see by the clock it is now one o'clock, so we will adjourn until two-thirty.

---Hearing adjourned.

- - - - -

---The Commission resumed at 2.30 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we have to hear is that of the Canadian Citizenship Council. Who is appearing on behalf of that organization?

MR. KIDD: My name is John Kidd, and with me is Mr. Dowd of the board of directors.

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP COUNCIL

Appearances:

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr. John P. Kidd | Executive Director |
| Mr. Norman Dowd | Director |

- - - - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: We are glad to see you here, and we will mark your brief as Exhibit 205. I believe that you were not here at the opening this morning, but what we like is to have the briefs presented to the Commission, and then we have some questions which are merely directed towards bringing out the various points in the brief and do not indicate any views that the Commission has yet reached, because we haven't reached any yet. Are you going to present the brief, Mr. Kidd?

MR. KIDD: Yes, sir.

---EXHIBIT NO. 205: Brief of Canadian Citizenship Council.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you proceed, please?

MR. KIDD: Well, I will be very brief. You will notice our brief is divided into three parts. The first part tells briefly what our organization is, the type of organization, and the fact that it is a council whose membership is made up of a great number of other organizations. Secondly, we have taken our objectives and we have stated them in terms of their relation to broadcasting. The balance of the brief is expressions of points of view on broadcasting in relation to our objectives. We have tried in this brief to project our objectives in the broadcasting field.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want you to rush too much through this presentation. I can understand that in regard to the earlier part as to the description of the Citizenship Council; we can read that, and have read it, but when you are dealing directly with broadcasting, I suggest that you outline some of the attitudes and points that you wish to put forward.

MR. KIDD: Well, I might start at page 2, Mr. Chairman, dealing with the objectives.

The Council is concerned with working towards an understanding on the part of Canadians, native born and newcomers, of the ideas and concepts of human dignity, human and civil rights, and individual worths summed up in the phrase "Democracy as a way of life". We feel broadcasting, both radio and television can do a great deal in that direction, but more than that, we feel that individual

citizens in a free society should be continually growing towards ability and aptitude and an attitude of participating in the management of human affairs, both in what we call official governments -- federal, provincial and municipal, and in unofficial governments -- the vast network of voluntary associations of one kind or another across the country. Here again we feel that broadcasting has a contribution to make to the growth of mature citizens experienced in democratic processes.

One of our objectives is the development of a greater sense of national unity and a greater national consciousness in the Canadian people, particularly at the present time with our economic growth that is taking place and we feel that broadcasting can play a very important role of helping Canadians in the Maritimes understand the people and the problems of Canadians in other parts of the country, perhaps more so than any other medium. We have in our country not only two major cultures, but with the immigration over the past years and particularly since the war, a group of other cultures that are making a contribution to this development of a nation. Here, too, broadcasting can attribute an understanding of these other cultures, and also these other cultures play a role in developing in what may become a Canadian culture. It is important in the development of a nation that people of that nation have some appreciation of their heritage.

We are concerned also with the rights of minorities and the right to hold minority or

individualistic opinion. Such minorities may be ethnic, religious, cultural, special interests, or individuals. Here, too, broadcasting can help create a climate in which such minorities can live with a freedom equal to that of majorities.

We have special interest in endeavouring to help newcomers coming to Canada, particularly since the war, to speedily become part of our Canadian society. Here is a real opportunity, we feel, for broadcasting.

In section 3 under "Points of view", we feel that there should be at least one national system. There are differences of opinion on our board as to whether there should be more than one national system, but there should be, at least, one system that is concerned with the interests of the whole of Canada. We expand that to say that it is important to have a complete system or, at least, a completely national system so that some of the things I have already mentioned can be brought about.

We raise the question of broadcasting as entertainment, and we do not question for one minute that successful broadcasting must also be successful entertainment, but we do say that this is also true of successful teaching or successful preaching, or even successful Board or Committee meetings, that the quality of the programme in terms of entertainment is important, but that successful entertainment can range from light comedy or great spectacles to highly intellectual discussions on science or philosophy.

We object to the suggestions made from time

to time that entertainment and successful broadcasting is only that which is pleasing and not unsettling to the greatest number of people. We also maintain that a successful broadcast, no matter what the content is, is also an educational and conditioning experience, and any assessment of broadcasting must include not only the content and the presentation, but what to us is even more important, the accumulative effect on the listeners. In many respects, radio and particularly television, are potentially as powerful as atomic energy; perhaps more so as they work to a much larger degree on the minds of men. They both can make for a better, richer and more abundant life; and they both can destroy it. They can destroy man's moral fibre and his sense of freedom.

We believe that no nation, if it values its freedom, not only its freedom as a nation, but the freedom of every individual in the nation, can let the limited mass medium of radio -- limited in the sense of being limited to a number of channels -- the mass medium of radio broadcasting become merely an advertising sheet to be used entirely or even largely for the purposes of enabling a handful of corporations or individuals to sell their wares. As no thinking democratic nation would turn over the responsibility of the educating of its young to the purveyors of that nation's and other nation's products, so would it be equally disastrous, educationally, in the long run, for Canada to do likewise with an educational and conditioning instrument of such tremendous influence upon the minds, attitudes and appetities of its citizens. We think, today, Canada has managed to work out a compromise between two extremes which has given us, for the peculiar needs and circumstances of our country, a fairly well balanced programme of broadcasting fare, both as to quality and content of presentation. We probably have the best balanced system in the world today and the fact that many of our programmes are of high quality is confirmed by the many international awards won by the Canadian programmes.

Now it is inevitable as only natural that from time to time we should make some modification in our system, but we feel that any such changes should be in the direction of respect for the maturity of the Canadian people and of sort of raising and

expanding that level of maturity, interest, values and tastes. We should not let broadcasting in Canada fall to the level of the "bread and circuses" of the dying days of the Roman Empire. Only an increasingly educated and mature people can cope with the complex problems of today and the rapidly increasingly complex problems of our growing nation and at the same time maintain and extend democracy and freedom; broadcasting in Canada must assume its major role and responsibility in the forward growth of Canada as a nation and a competent, responsible and democratic people.

Now under financing, we have not gone into detail on financing. We did not feel we were competent to do this. We do feel, however, that broadcasting, both radio and television, particularly television, is a media of influence, appeal and accumulated effect on the people of Canada so that it is therefore, an instrument of tremendous importance -- either positively or negatively. We believe it can be an instrument for the educating by the government of its citizens and if the real war, as has been said time and again is for men's minds broadcasting can help out in that war immeasurably, and we suggest it is as important, perhaps, not in the amount of money, particularly, in any particular year, as the National Defence expenditures which take almost 50 per cent of the national income to maintain the force and develop the force to destroy bodies if a war should come. Consequently it is our view that the expenditure on the CBC to enable it in a variety of ways to

strengthen and increase the maturity and democratic fibre of the Canadian people is an expenditure of equal importance to that of National Defence.

We have, on page 8, made the attempt to show that it is a myth that broadcasting if paid for out of advertising is not paid for the Canadian people. They maintain that the source of the money that pays for the broadcasting programmes is still the same source, however different the route. The Canadian people still have to pay for the advertising supported programmes, but it is a much more indirect and hidden payment, but the Canadian people still pay. And what is more, while they have some idea of how much they pay through the money voted to the CBC, they have no idea how much they pay through advertising.

The question of control of broadcasting is one we feel is of greatest importance. Where the ultimate and final control of broadcasting lies. We have suggested on page 8, it might fall somewhere or other in three places. The parlaiment of Canada, where it theoretically rests now; the federal political party in power, where some people feel that it in fact rests now or, the large corporations capable of using broadcasting of a national advertising media, both Canadian and American.

It is absolutely imperative that broadcasting control and the control of policy and content does not rest with that segment of the Canadian people, and some of the American counterparts, whose one purpose of using broadcasting is to sell their products to the

most number of people. We reject all arguments favouring the use of broadcasting as solely and primarily an advertising sheet, with control of policy and content subject to the specific needs of the advertisers.

While it will be denied that the control of the CBC and of broadcasting in Canada lies ultimately with the present party in power, several incidents during the past several years tend to throw some doubt on this. And while it may be true that the present government in power has not unduly influenced the CBC in matters of policy and content of programmes, we know not what kind of government or what kind of men may be in control of government in the years ahead. But more than that, it is our incontrovertible view that there should be no influence whatsoever and no control whatsoever by the government in power of the national public broadcasting system. Control there should be, but it should rest with parliament and parliament alone, and not with the government in power.

Now we have made a recommendation on this and we say in the support of this recommendation, perhaps we should not have put it in as a recommendation, perhaps, we should not have put it in as a recommendation, perhaps we should have stated it in some different way, maybe it was not possible for the CBC or for broadcasting in Canada to be free of influence, or free of control, or free, to some extent, from the party in power, but where it rests is an extremely serious and important aspect.

We close our brief with a number of quotations:

> "In a free democracy it is essential that each man have an understanding of himself and his job in its context. He must know enough about his society to act as an intelligent citizen in it; and he should be familiar with its culture to be able to make intelligent individual choices in life. Our schools attempt to equip every child with the spirit of learning in the faith that 'citizenship of the world of knowledge' is equally important to the mechanic, the industrialist, and the lawyer.'

It is our view that broadcasting is, in fact, a great school or university for all the people of all ages; it has both the opportunity and the responsibility of enhancing the citizenship of all Canadians and Canadians-to-be through opportunities of growth in that "citizenship of the world of knowledge".

The second quotation is from the annual report of the president of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association, dated January 27th, 1956. It reads as follows:

> "We have one main responsibility, namely, the maintenance of freedom itself. For without freedom, enterprise is doomed. With increasing social security, we may be tempted to shelve this responsibility and to lean upon government. And the more we lean on government, the more we shall encourage

"mediocrity and its tyrannies. One great safeguard against this lies in our universities. As an industry dependent upon the growth of knowledge, we must increasingly lean on and support the universities and the human beings they develop, not alone those in the technical field, but especially those in the humanities. For the kind of business leadership required in a rapidly advancing economy, I can think of no greater need than for the products of a solid liberal education. These are the minds that are often best equipped to value freedom, to preserve enterprise, and to meet the human and social problems that surround the unfolding of democracy. Democracy, like capitalism, must be made to bear good fruit in the strange new world which we are really just entering. If those in this great national industry do not assume their share of this responsibility, it may well fall upon very strange shoulders indeed."

In an age and a society that is becoming increasingly interdependent and complex, while at the same time providing man with ever greater time for leisure, and thus making even greater demands upon man, his awareness and his understanding, and his ability to cope with the day-to-day problems of interdependence and complexity, we suggest that if the great national industry, broadcasting, does not

assume its opportunity and its share of responsibility, through its peculiar and strategic media in the growth of liberal education, not only in universities and among university graduates, but among all Canadians, then democracy may well fall upon strange shoulders and take on a very strange guise.

We also raise the question in our final point of the excessive dumping, not only on the broadcasts but other mass medias of American ideas, advertising, radio broadcasting programmes, magazines and so on, particularly broadcasting. We do not object to taking in American programmes, but we feel this should be watched very closely and that this whole problem of the dumping of foreign ideas on Canada and Canadians paying for the distribution and the proportion of these ideas is something that needs to be looked at in terms of radio broadcasting as well as in terms of the other mass media.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you anything to say Mr. Dowd?

MR. DOWD: I don't think so, I am giving moral support to the council. As you know my own organization has already appeared before the Commission and I think, will probably will appear a second time, but certainly our ideas, to a very considerable extent, agree with Mr. Kidd's presentation and we are very anxious that the broadcasting facilities in Canada should be used to promote citizenship and develop a mature and responsible nation and that, I think, essentially is the basis of the briefs of both organizations.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I have some questions on the possibility of a private network running parallel to the publicly owned system but from Mr. Kidd's remarks there is some difference between the members of the council. I take it he prefers not to be asked questions on that particular point.

MR. KIDD: I am only speaking from my personal point of view.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You have indicated, Mr. Kidd, that your organization worked in the past in connection with official and unofficial governments of this country. You indicate that you have worked with federal, provincial and municipal organizations. Will you tell us if you have worked as an association in conjunction with the CBC in the past?

MR. KIDD: Yes.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You have? And you have found the mechanics of the CBC organization were sufficient to cope with this situation; did you feel it was a little cumbersome and that you did not know exactly where to go to make representation?

MR. KIDD: No, I had no difficulty that way. If we had a programme we knew whom to go to and always had excellent hearings.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you feel then the system as it is proves adequate or would you rather agree with these suggestions that have been made to us that committees and subcommittees should be established to supervise or solicit the recommendations from various groups such as educational groups and artistic groups and religious groups

and so forth. We have been receiving those suggestions that special committees and special adult councils should be formed in order to gather or channel all these recommendations that are susceptible to being made by various groups such as yours or such as your council and other similar organizations.

MR. KIDD: Well, merely basing this on my experience with the CBC over the past nine years that I have been with the Council and some knowledge of another organization, the Adult Education, I see no need of such. I think the channels that are open there is a readiness to accept, as far as programming is concerned, a readiness to accept ideas and suggestions.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think behind Mr. de Grandpre's question is the numerous suggestions we have had for consultative committees of one sort and another. I have not tabled these up, but if we accepted all of them we would have all the people of Canada sitting as consultants to the CBC. I think Mr. de Grandpre was trying to get on this point whether there is or should be some basic machinery in the CBC to whom people could go with some suggestions, some sort of feature in a very specialized way, of the Public Relations Branch of the CBC, so that these very important and much desired public ideas would not get bogged down in the system or in the machinery anywhere, but would actually get through. Now, in your experience, is something more needed or does it work?

MR. KIDD: In my experience nothing more is needed now; you can always get bogged down in that kind of front office, but if I have an idea for the talks department or the drama department I have been able to go right through to the talks department or the drama department, sit down and talk with them about it. If I first

had to go to a front office or a clearing house I do not know how soon I would get through to the back office. There may be some wasted time or effort by the thing being sifted as to whether or not it was a props thing or a drama thing that was to be done. I am not sure that kind of extra machinery is needed at the present time. Now, there may be other groups who find they have not got the same access I have, but I think that geography is a factor. The people in Vancouver may have some difficulty, they cannot drop in to Toronto as readily as we can and sit down and meet the people.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Have you always had to initiate these discussions or do they usually come to you?

MR. KIDD: They on occasion come to us and say, "Is this a good idea?" or, "What do you think of this?" or "How would you handle this in terms of is it needed?" It is a two-way thing.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: It is a two-way street?

MR. KIDD: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: To summarize this line of questioning, have you in your experience dealing with the CBC found a reasonably open door, an open minded sort of policy, or is it what you would put in quotation marks as being a "bureaucratic organization" that you cannot get at?

MR. KIDD: I have no difficulty getting at them, and have an excellent reception and

hearing, and I see them frequently, too.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You have also commented at some length on the statement that there cannot be any severance between entertainment and culture or education programmes. I take it from your remarks that you would, or am I right in assuming from your remarks that you would disagree with some of the suggestions that have been made to the Commission that the CBC should concentrate on educational programmes and let the private broadcasters spend advertiser's money for entertainment programmes and put a wall between the two?

MR. KIDD: No, I would not suggest that at all. Personally, I think it is important that the CBC carry football games. Now, that is entertainment, it is educational, too, but I like football games and there are a lot of other Canadians who like football games. I think that here is a national service that can be carried by the national system. There are other kinds of programmes I like also, but I am not sure; I think what we want in our national system is a balanced programme. Not every programme will appeal to everyone; some of the programmes may appeal to less than one per cent who look at it, but that one per cent is still a fair number of people in the country. Another programme should appeal to more, but I think in the month's programming there should be a fair balancing the same way as if I buy a magazine, there may be one article in that magazine that might appeal to me; out of that magazine I may

get one article, but the other articles may appeal to other groups with special interests.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You just said that our system should have a balanced diet of programmes?

MR. KIDD: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But our system is made of two different elements; it is made of the publicly owned part of it and the privately owned national system. Would it not be possible to see a balanced diet produced by CBC when we are dealing with enlightenment programmes and letting the private broadcaster do the entertainment side of it, and therefore reduce the cost to the Canadian taxpayer?

MR. KIDD: Well, I do not know whether it would reduce the costs of the Canadian taxpayer. I think they still pay for it. It may reduce the cost of the taxes or the amount of money that is earmarked for the public system in taxes, but it has still got to be paid for either way. It has still got to be paid for by the Canadian people; maybe a little more comes out of one pocket for one system and it comes out of that pocket for another system, but it still comes from the pockets of the people of the country. My own view is that where a second national system -- and this is my own view -- this second system should be as well balanced as the present system on both counts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you say that this suggestion of more or less abandoning the lighter entertainment type of programme by CBC and

concentrating on the more serious, enlightenment type of programme would probably end up by not having a balanced fare, a balanced menu?

MR. KIDD: I think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: You might even go so far as to say you would actually lose the audience for your more serious type of programme if you did not have the others sitting around?

MR. KIDD: I think this, I am not too concerned with the statements we hear from time to time, sometimes criticizing the CBC of trying to pour culture down the throats of Canadians. I think there is evidence that the tastes, sense of values of different kinds of programmes, that the accumulated effect of watching both television and listening to radio over a number of years can raise the whole level of appreciation, the whole level of sensitive value. I have been told this by the British Y.M.C.A.; in their experience they supplied, as you know, among other things, reading material for the troops in the First World War and the Second World War, and they tell me that the kind of material which was requested by the troops in the Second World War was away higher in terms of level and interest. There was the penny novel in the Second World War, sure; they wanted some of that, but they also wanted biography, they wanted books on science. The British Y.M.C.A. people feel that the BBC over a period of years has carefully raised the level of taste and appreciation and the interest of the British

people. Now, I have not any suggestions on that, but that is what I was told during the war, and I think it is possible that the general level of interest and taste and sense of value on the part of any people can be raised if they have an opportunity. Now, if you have got one system which is doing football games and light stuff and you have another system that is giving the more serious type of programme, you are going to have this one station turned on all the time; it is not likely to produce a general development of mature people, which I think is important. They are going to cope with the problems which trouble us in television.

If there are two systems I feel they should not be balanced, they should be just like a third class carriage or a first class carriage. It is important that the education of children be carried on through educational institutions and for our young people, in college, but it is important that we use other means of raising the level of education, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you really saying there that you do not just judge this thing to be, to use the ordinary phrase, "Give the people what they want", because they might want something different if they knew it existed?

MR. KIDD: That is right.

MR. de GRANDPRE: On page 9 you have this recommendation:

> "We strongly recommend, therefore, that the necessary legislation be enacted

to eliminate as far as possible this frightening potential threat to freedom by providing the machinery for the CBC to be truly responsible to Parliament and to report directly, not through a Minister of the Government, to Parliament."

I notice there that you underline the words "report directly"; can you elaborate on this, please?

MR. KIDD: Well, in the first place, this is, I understand, quite contrary to the present practice, and it might be quite contrary to principles applying to representative government. In our concept of government today in Canada, a Minister of the Crown should be responsible for any moneys that are expended, and unless a Corporation such as the CBC reports through a Minister, that does not follow. Actually, we have not thought through the consequences of this ratification of the terms of constitution of Government at all; it is put there, perhaps, in the way of emphasizing what we feel potentially may become a serious situation. We agree that there has been some influence on the part of the present party in power with CBC, but to what extent it is we do not know, if a Minister is put in what I think is rather an embarrassing situation at times of having to answer for the CBC, criticism for the CBC, as has happened in the House. It is quite human to have a slip of the tongue, as happened on the 14th of August when there was reference to the CBC, when the Minister said, in effect -- I have forgotten his exact words -- but

he said, "I and the CBC will see that it does not happen again". I think it is one thing for him to say that the CBC may have said this will not happen again, but it is a different thing for him to say "I and they won't". I think he made a slip of the tongue; I know there was a pretty hot debate, but I think it is quite conceivable in the years ahead that we may get a government in power that is not as appreciative, shall I say, of the concepts or the rights of the government in power and the rights of the people, as we have today. Under the present circumstances I think it would be quite easy to abuse this national medium without too much difficulty to their own ends. Some of the critics of the present party say they are doing it now, but I think that this problem is going to have a tremendous control of this very influential medium which goes right into the homes of the people. Where is that control going to lie?

Now, the Act says that Parliament -- well, the question is, if it lies with Parliament to whom is the CBC responsible? Is it directly responsible to Parliament or to the Minister or the Cabinet?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the real question is, let us assume the basic suggestion is valid, there cannot be too much argument about that, but how do you do it; how do you report directly to Parliament, physically or mechanically? This is the real problem. I think anyone will probably go along rather quickly with the notion that you do

not want government intervention with this very powerful medium; let us assume it is desirable that they should report directly to Parliament, but how do you do it? You can report periodically to money votes before committees, and debate in open Parliament on money votes, but if some recommendations are accepted, there may be fairly long-term statutory grants so that it may happen only every three or four or five years. What happens if -- let us take an extreme example; it probably never would happen -- the Crown agency began to be profligate and wasteful of public money; how do you assert that control in Parliament?

MR. KIDD: Well, I do not know.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes; we don't either. I am not trying to break down your brief, Mr. Kidd, it is just that this is a very real point and a very important point, and we are looking for all the help we can get as to how to go about providing a public operation such as this and to provide for the expenditure of public moneys in an efficient way and a businesslike fashion.

MR. DOWD: The nearest thing you can get to it is reporting to a Standing Committee of Parliament, I would say, and you usually find that the Standing Committees are in progress during the whole of the session, so that it is only for part of the recess, you might say, that the CBC couldn't get its views across to Parliament if it wished. In any event, the members of Parliament are quoted in the newspaper and the Opposition is supposed to take care of a certain amount of criticism of what is going on. As a matter of fact, I would say that the CBC does report to Parliament in that limited sense, and it does to the nation. After all, anything the CBC does is essentially an open book, and every member of Parliament is quite familiar with its operation, I should think.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, it is true, but let us take the case Mr. Kidd was suggesting a moment ago, of the particular programme which led to a question in the House. Is it correct, do you think, that such questions should be raised in the House; if they should somebody has got to

answer them.

MR. DOWD: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: How do you go about this?

MR. DOWD: Well, as Mr. Kidd was saying a moment ago, you might get a backbench minister who says "we won't bring this up in the House, or if we do bring it up, we will do so in such a fashion that it answers itself, the wrong way, in advance."

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: But the House may not be sitting when it is important to have an inquiry on an infringement of the right of speech, or something of that nature, which the CBC might do, and has to be stopped more or less immediately, and the House doesn't meet for three months.

MR. DOWD: Yes, I know.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: There has to be responsibility somewhere, not only resting with the CBC, but someone higher than that, who will have to report to Parliament on whatever action he has taken or fails to take.

MR. DOWD: It should go to the Government rather than to a Minister. The Government, after all, is responsible to the country and to Parliament.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we are trying to work out a system whereby we could provide public funds for a desired national function and escape some of the traditional difficulties and fears which we have with respect to the control of those funds.

MR. DOWD: That is true -- that is true,

but I would say that the CBC system has worked very well, even within the double-barrelled system, if you like. We would simply suggest more emphasis, more and more emphasis, be laid on the angles of education for citizenship as one of the basic functions of a national system, partly by entertainment, partly by making its educational content entertaining

THE CHAIRMAN: We are very grateful to you, Mr. Kidd and Mr. Dowd, for your brief and for your presentation.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief will be that of the Citizens Committee on Children.

## SUBMISSION OF CITIZENS COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN

Appearances:

Mr. J. M. Meiklejohn,
Chairman, Radio and TV Committee

Mr. A. O. Gibbons, Vice-President

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Meiklejohn, will you be presenting the brief?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Yes, I will, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit 206.

EXHIBIT NO. 206: Brief of the Citizens Committee on Children.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Meiklejohn, perhaps

you will wish to summarize your brief as in the previous case.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Yes, I think I could quickly summarize it, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: I take it from this brief that you have a rather specialized point of view and a point of some importance.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Yes, we are dealing with a specialized point; we are a specialized field and our special field is children.

In our first page we try to summarize the type of organization we are. We are a unique organization, I think, in Canada, although we are only an Ottawa organization, as far as the greatest part of our field is concerned, and it is in respect of children that we are speaking. We feel that we have, as it were, a brief for children.

It is in these terms that we have approached the problem. Our own reading and the reading of our various briefs has led us to believe that television is a very potent -- perhaps the most potent -- means of communication, and that it is particularly potent for children. In fact, all the material that we have collected and read on the subject would lead us to believe that children between the ages of four and twelve are probably the most avid tele-viewers, and we feel that this is important. These are the citizens of tomorrow, and the ideas these children assimilate may have an important bearing on their actions when they become older, and,

accordingly, have a bearing on the future of this country. We feel that the periods at which most children do view television should be devoted to programmes which will help to develop their minds and imaginations and assist them in becoming good Canadians as they grow up. We realize that this is a question of programming, and programming is difficult.

We realize that somebody may define particular hours as children's hours, and yet that the children will watch the programmes which are not in these particular hours. We do, however, urge that it is in the public interest to scrutinize very closely the particular programmes for the age group of from four to twelve.

We realize that your Commission, sir, is seeking a solution for financial problems and that programming is not your particular concern, but we can't see how you can talk about finances without talking about programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is fairly clear from the Order in Council itself because they tell us to determine the financial requirements in the light of desirable programming, so we are right back from where we started from.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: And we also realize that the ultimate control of these matters must rest with the taste and intelligence of the parents, and that no control will stop a child from watching programmes which are unsuitable if his parents allow him to watch them.

We also realize that even though programmes may be prepared which are regarded as suitable programmes for children, it does not necessarily mean that the child will watch them or will get anything from them. It is urged, however, that any government sponsored authority has a responsibility to the public continuously to seek to improve public taste and to lead rather than to be led by the audience for whom it provides entertainment.

We have noted that the CBC over the years has been able to do this in the field of radio broadcasting, particularly for children, and we have also noted that the CBC has done a great deal to encourage Canadian talent in all areas and to provide an opportunity for Canadians to seek a livelihood in Canada in the arts, and give them some modest recompense for their work.

We have also noted that the CBC has managed to establish a number of fine radio programmes for children. We do not feel that the same thing has quite been worked out in the field of television. Steps have been taken in respect of adult programmes and we feel that that is where the money has been spent. We feel that in judging the successes of children's programmes the response shown by the public to supporting advertiser has often been the criterion on which they have been kept on or taken off. This might indicate that it is difficult to find sponsors for high calibre programmes, and we

feel that this fact should not in any way lessen the responsibility of the telecasting authorities to maintain a high standard of programming. We feel that the immediate public reaction should not be the only criteria for the success or failure of a programme.

We do not know of any Canadian studies; we haven't done any ourselves, but this is something that we should like to have done and studied before we came here, but we are hoping to initiate studies very shortly. We have, however, had access to some very careful studies which have been done in the States by the National Association for Better Radio and Television, which has sought to class children's programmes as either helpful or harmful. Without commenting on their methods of evaluation, we have noted with some concern that of the American programmes currently available for children, Canadian television channels have a higher proportion of the allegedly harmful programmes than do the Americans.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where is that study to be found, the National Association for Better Radio and Television?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: They issue, I think, a monthly report, which is a guide to parents as to what they should let the children see and what they should not see. We haven't done any work particularly on what their methods of evaluation are.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That report would be available ---

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: It is available to the public.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: ... only to citizens of Ottawa, because you are a local association?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: We are a local association. This is an American report which some of our members subscribe to and buy.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think when we get to that at the final hearings, we might ask the CBC how this thing stands up and what their comment is on it.

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: All we could do was look at programmes available to ourselves and look at the lists. We do not believe that the weaknesses on which we have commented are the result of a monopoly by CBC. On the contrary, we feel what has been done for our children on radio is a test of ability to give such programmes, and they will not follow the world in television. As you have said already, with the special committee on broadcasting in the House of Commons, Canadian broadcasting should be such as to express Canadian ideas and aspirations in the greatest ratio possible.

Finally, sir, we know that no action by either a Royal Commission or Parliament will solve all the problems of television now or even in two or three years. All we are urging is that our children are Canada's greatest natural resource; that those who have the control of television in their hands, have a tremendous power for good or evil in the lives of these children.

We feel that such power must be in the hands of a responsible authority, an authority responsible to the people of Canada.

We feel that in deciding how public money should be spent on the provision of television programmes, consideration should be given to the product and in particular to the product which is addressed to our Canadian children.

We urge that public money which is spent in making Canadian children into imaginative, intelligent Canadian citizens, is public money well spent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Meiklejohn.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Following the same line of discussion that we have followed with the previous witness, you list the associations with which your committee has worked in the past, and I see that you have not mentioned the CBC. Do I take it that you have never been able to influence the CBC on children's programmes?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Personally, sir, I haven't

attempted to, and I would like to ask Mrs. Smith, who was our president for several years, to answer that question.

MRS. SMITH: Well, actually because TV has come very recently to Ottawa, we have only put forward one suggestion to the CBC. I think, as Mr. Fowler said, this idea that has come up several times about an advisory committee would be something that our CCC would have welcomed in this particular case. This was an idea we had run as an experiment in our public schools in Ottawa, and we felt that it was something which would benefit the country as a whole. This is on international relations on children, with children of other lands, and it was rather an original programme. We presented this as an idea to the CBC, but I think it would have perhaps lived longer if it had gone to an advisory board instead of being dealt with as an individual thing. We were advised by the CBC -- perhaps by some person or persons that not to take it as a committee on children's programmes, but simply as an idea. We were anxious to see it go across, and I think if we had felt the people who were judging this as an idea were people who had a little more knowledge on children's interests and ways, instead of individual directors, it might have lived a little longer in its conception. One thing Mr. Meiklejohn said which I think I may make a little clearer: we are a local committee, but we

have done quite a few things of national significance. We have worked very closely with the Physical Fitness Department of the National Health and Welfare Council with, for example, booklets for them to use, and we have recently published a new book ourselves called "What's What for Children", giving advice to parents across Canada, which is beautifully advertised by CBC on television for us and sold 8,000 copies just simply by its television broadcast. In other words, it got to the people across Canada in very quick time through that medium. In other words, we have done things that have had national significance as well as just local. We try to run experiments here, and if they are good we try to pass them on to national organizations or through a medium like a booklet which can reach other people besides those in Ottawa. We feel some of our ideas for television may be of use because we have experimented here locally with them such as Children of Other Lands, which we worked through separate and public schools, and ran a live programme, and we could certainly use a medium like television to put that across. I am not saying there are not a million reasons why a particular thing like this floundered, but I think a group like ours across Canada would welcome a board, which, like the CBC, would do the school broadcasts where it is a group who know children and who are valuing it from the point of view of how much children can take, and what kind of reception a child will get for its special age.

MR. deGRANDPRE: You have limited your answer to the television field. Have you made any attempts in radio?

MRS. SMITH: Actually, not through children's programmes, but we have done quite a bit of parent education and have been invited by the CBC to do that sort of thing in the parent education field. I am limiting my answers to the briefs, which we limit to one form, which was children on television.

MR. deGRANDPRE: And you feel had there been a special department or special standing committee planning all programmes or something of the sort at CBC you could have achieved better results than referring the matter to a producer as an individual?

MRS. SMITH: I think on this point the ideas, when the world has so many opinions on child development, and there is so much knowledge around, you would like to see some of that used in connection with children's programmes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I am not too clear about your paragraph on the sponsorship of children's programmes: whether you have an objection in principle to sponsorship of children's programmes or whether you feel that the final say should be with the CBC, and the programme being produced, it could be up to the sponsor to buy it or to refuse it as is, without the sponsor having any say in the programme content?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: We feel that the type of programme which is sponsored for children is very

seldom the best type of programme, and that we cannot see that the type of people who sponsor programmes are the type of people who are really judges of what a child should see. I am sure that a number of briefs must have commented on the violence content of programmes. A great number of people to whom we have spoken in this connection talk about that and the sponsors' programmes are the ones where it is found most frequently. I haven't any particular views on violence in programmes, whether the children should be taught violence or not. They certainly react to it, but we do know that the sponsored programmes are the ones to which people have the most objection.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you don't go so far as to suggest that because of this influence that sponsorship seems to have on the choice of programmes as to recommend that all sponsorship of children's programmes should be eliminated?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: No. Rather, sir, we are recommending that somebody other than a sponsor should be the judge of whether a programme is a suitable one for children or not.

MR. deGRANDPRE: And if they can find a sponsor, it should be done?

MR. MEIKLEJOHN: Yes, indeed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much, all of you, for bringing this brief; we will consider it.

---A short recess.

SUBMISSION OF
DR. A. R. M. LOWER - QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY

Appearances:

Dr. A. R. M. Lower

- - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is that of Dr. A. R. M. Lower, Queen's University, and we will begin by marking it as Exhibit No. 207.

EXHIBIT NO. 207: Brief of Dr. A. R. M. Lower Queen's University.

THE CHAIRMAN: We would appreciate very much, Dr. Lower, hearing your submission, and take whatever time you require, following which we may have some questions for you. In fact, it would be an exception if we did not have some questions because that is the way we have been proceeding, and those questions are, of course, designed to bring out the full views of the witness and are not intended to indicate any point of view we may have reached, as we have not reached a point of view yet. We would appreciate your presenting your brief to us.

MR. LOWER: I should explain I am presenting this brief as an individual and you will also find somewhere in that collection a similar brief of the Canadian Radio and Television League. My brief, perhaps, goes a little further than the brief presented by the League, and I have decided to present it as an individual. It is

rather long and I would not like to take the time of the Commission ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps certain views you will be able to summarize, but we all know of your position as a historian in Canada, and your views are important to us.

MR. LOWER: The reason that brought me here was the supreme importance of this subject, and I felt no citizen can avoid giving whatever effort and insight he has to the subject of television and broadcasting in view of our national situation, and that is echoed in my brief, on the first page, and if I might omit the preliminary part I shall proceed with the primary basis of public broadcasting and television which is a primary need.

The primary basis on which I put public broadcasting and television is the simple one of national needs. I am convinced that it is only the organization of the CBC and its provision of national coverage which has saved this country from something like disintegration. This is a strong statement. Intentionally so. I am convinced of its validity. Because of the increasing importance of this medium of communication, its increasing pressure on the individual, and because of the increasing value of that pressure that comes to us from the south. It seems to me you cannot understand this whole business without taking a wide look at it in a historical way, and I attempted to do that on page 1 at

the bottom under the heading of "The Historical Setting".

There is no doubt but that the Canadian Confederation itself, as it was formed in the 1860's, was a resultant of the pressures from the United States. The Americans were fighting their Civil War and, after the Civil War, they had a large unemployed army on their hands. Enunciations of the doctrine of "manifest destiny" had been numerous; many an American had proclaimed that the whole hemisphere from the Rio Grande to the North Pole must be American. Such proclamations sent shivers of apprehension through British subjects in North America. Added to this, there were the threats from the Fenian movement and the various raids which took place in the years 1866-1867. Still another type of pressure from the United States took the form of the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty in the year 1866. The scattered British provinces, on their part, came to recognize that for them it was a case of unite or be absorbed. When this conviction had come fully home, it proved possible to set the great project of Confederation going. The meaning of that project simply was that British North Americans had decided not to become members of the American union but to forge a separate nationality for themselves. Now, all Canadian history since that date illustrates the point. The Canadian Confederation thus came into existence as an attempt to maintain a scattered group of provinces against the magnetic power of

the United States.

Everything in Canada is based on that, that we decided to form a separate national union rather than risk the danger of absorption.

The next heading is "Canadian Confederation a Tour de Force."

No one has ever pretended that the arrangement by which these provinces, and others subsequently added, came together into one political framework, was from the point of view of logic, geography and economics, ever more than artificial. No less an authority than Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself once said that he felt that, of all unlikely sites for a nation, Canada was the most unlikely. It is only necessary to glance at that map to see the basis for that contention. It is true that hopes were expressed at the time that British North America would, by reason of a larger trading area, secure something of the same type of prosperity as had been experienced by the vast free trading area known as the United States, but the major emphasis was not on the creation of another continental area of trade. Benefits in that direction were to be incidental, and it has taken us from that day to this to devise means for their realization. Confederation will never be understood unless it is viewed as the creation of a political entity based on the faith that in time this artificial entity would take on reality, that the skeleton would become clothed with flesh and nourished with blood.

Despite the handicaps which nature has

imposed on us, few people would deny today that we have, in fact, created a nation of considerable strength.

Now, here are the means by which we have done so. While it is impossible to refer to them in detail, they can be outlined.

First of all territorially: Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories were brought in, and, out of these lands the Province of Manitoba, and later the two Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were created. Then British Columbia, and Prince Edward Island were brought in. Lastly, Newfoundland was added.

And secondly, to the territorial expansion, we have our railway achievement. Canada was not far from unique in the agencies which she devised to pull her great expanse of territory together. Among these means, perhaps the most important was the building of the first transcontinental railroad, the Canadian Pacific Railway. Everyone knows the dramatic story of the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the difficulties encountered, the faith involved, the happy conjunction of public and private effort so severely condemned at the time, and the eventual successful result.

Now, another one of these agencies is the chartered banks. Paralleling a national transcontinental railroad was the erection into a national system of the Canadian financial structure based on the chartered bank. The Bank Act

of 1873 was in its way as important a contribution to national policy as was the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for by certain of its provisions, it prevented our financial structure from becoming a mere adjunct of that of the United States. If Canadian banks are still Canadian and not controlled from New York, that is because of the Bank Act of 1873 and its subsequent amendments. And our Canadian Banks, so close to the Canadian state, are, of course, quasi-public enterprises.

Another agency still of Confederation is the National Policy. Five years after the first Bank Act, there was begun the celebrated National Policy (1878). Whatever we may think of the theory of free trade and protection, most of us would have to agree that it is a good thing for the national community to retain some degree of control over the national economy. It is true that the National Policy, in its inception, was not much more than a crudely protective device, but it did give considerable emphasis to the word "national". The protective tariff may also be regarded as a device for making industry into a quasi-public undertaking. It would be illogical for any manufacturer whose existence depends on public legislation to claim that he was entirely devoted to the creed of free enterprise.

THE CHAIRMAN: Some of us might be very startled to hear that.

MR. LOWER: They probably would be.

There is a very simple test as to whether they would be believe it or not. (Laughter)

A tariff economy and a free enterprise economy do not go together.

This example of the National Policy indicates how far we have been in Canada from adopting the simple creed of laisser-faire. We have never hesitated to invoke the power of the state for national interests, and, of course, we could not exist for ten minutes unless we were continuously doing so. There are plenty of other examples to adduce in support of this generalization.

After this policy there is a considerable pause and there is nothing of any magnitude until we come to the twentieth century.

The continued association of government and economic development was to be illustrated once more in the late 19th and 20th century in the fields of railroading, water power development, and the public land. In railroading, it is unnecessary to retell the story of the building of the second and third transcontinentals, which were eventually combined to form the present Canadian National Railways. In the development of water power, we had the beginnings of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission, which has since grown into what is probably the greatest public ownership undertaking on the continent. Ontario also led the way in using the public power to prevent exploitation of its forests by foreign

capitalists. This is a very interesting example, and I do not suppose it is very well known. It prevented the export of sawlogs cut on Crown lands, and moving them over to the north shore of Lake Huron and securing more of the value of the forest for Canadian citizens. Other provinces have since followed Ontario's example. In respect to public land, the period referred to saw the shifting of the western lands from the ownership by the Crown to private individuals. We do not, as a rule, put very much attention in Canada on this vast process, the division of the land itself, but it is, of course, a good illustration of that close partnership between the state and the private individual upon which our life has been based. The state must provide the general overall plan and the general machinery by which the individual gets his holdings and is enabled to develop them.

The result of all these interactions of public and private enterprise was the building of the physical basis of modern Canada: the half continental area, the transcontinental railroads, the general financial system, the basis for land-holding, and a conception, first developed in the Province of Ontario, that the natural wealth of the country must be developed for the benefit of its own citizens. In all of these cases the same combination is visible, that is to say, the public power and private initiative.

Now, the next section I have is The Canadian Pattern, or Plan.

About the period of the First World War and certainly by the period of the 1920's, a distinctly Canadian pattern was becoming visible; in leaving plenty of space for private initiative and private development, the community also insisted on safeguarding the great fundamentals which were vital to its own existence and it was finding the best safeguarding device to lie in some kind of public ownership and operation. Few people pressed home the logic of the combination of its ultimate conclusion, that is, few insisted either on the complete elimination of public ownership or of private ownership. What was developing was a combination of both, together with a considerable degree of regulation of both.

The combination was a logical one, for most Canadians wished to be interfered with in their private lives as little as possible, and yet they also wished their country's continued existence. It became more and more evident that the point of departure had been Confederation in 1867. In that year we had decided to make a nation, and it could almost have been added "cost what it may". We had formally reaffirmed our decision at the polls in 1891 and 1911, and we were working out a systematic plan for the country based on these decisions. It may be said that Canada from the first has been a country of a plan, not a "five-year plan", but at least a hundred-year plan. Nearly ninety of these years have now unrolled and the plan is still incomplete, though its main outlines

are now clearly visible. Naturally, the Fathers of Confederation could not look forward to ninety years, but they could plan the main outlines of a state, and it is remarkable how closely their original vision has been realized.

Now, you don't do all that sort of thing without it costing you something, so the next section is the Cost of Nationhood.

The essence of their decision was to make a nation despite the force of geography. Naturally that could not be done without cost. There is no question but that our separate existence as a nation costs each and every individual Canadian a very considerable sum of money every year. If we were part of an unrestricted continental economy, there are probably hundreds of articles for which we would pay less, our lines of communication would run in rather different directions -- it is doubtful if there would still be continuous rail communication north of the Lakes -- and altogether our life would be largely arranged on other lines. Canadians are constantly re-assessing the wisdom of the original decision: some lean to a severe realism which would incorporate us with the continental economy, and some are prepared to avoid that fate at all costs, believing themselves thereby to be maintaining, if not their bank accounts, their souls. By and large, for over ninety years Canadians have decided, and more than once, that it is more important to them to maintain their souls than to maintain their bank

accounts: if that were not the case, Canada would long since have ceased to exist. As one intelligent American observer put it, "You Canadians must certainly attach great importance to your right to separate existence, for you obviously are willing to pay highly for it".

Now, I think today we value that right, and, without any feeling of enmity or hostility towards our American friends. That is not the point, and I refer to that further down. It is not a matter of hostility toward the United States, although, of course, when Confederation was undertaken there was a considerable element had that feeling present, but today we simply wish to be ourselves.

Since the 1920's, the devices by which communities are able to hold together have multiplied in number and in range. Among these, of course, air transportation, sound broadcasting, and now sight broadcasting stand out in significance. Canada has dealt with each one of these in the same way as she dealt with the older modes of communication and of national integration. No theories have been advanced, and very few references have been made to past action but, in each case, the same type of solution has been reached. When the airways were being developed, it was decided that there should be a system of national transcontinental air communication; Trans-Canada Air Lines is the result. The existence of Trans-Canada Air Lines does not prevent the existence of private airways. Air transportation gives us one more illustration of the Canadian pattern: a public system maintained with the express intention of binding the country together, and various private systems existing primarily for the benefit of their operators, but also serving more or less useful local purposes.

When broadcasting came in, after a good deal of preliminary discussion and reports which will be familiar to the members of this Commission, the same pattern was hit upon: various private radio stations came into existence and the CBC (or its predecessor) was set up. Again when radio extended into television, the same pattern was applied. The latest example of this combination of public and private ownership is under debate at the moment in the proposals for bringing Alberta natural gas to the eastern provinces.

All these examples illustrate what has become a conspicuous Canadian pattern -- enough public ownership and control to maintain the country's identity and integration, and no particular sentiment against private enterprise within these limitations. Since each situation has been approached empirically, no formal and general rule has ever been laid down for the supervision of the various pairs of twins. In most cases, some kind of control authority has come into existence to supervise both the government project and the private enterprise. It is not, however, possible to argue that this method of public supervision is a necessity and should not be departed from. In the case of the railways, the Board of Railway Commissioners preceded the most important instances of public ownership, and was set up to adjudicate between various sets of private interests. In the case of the chartered banks, a slow evolution has taken place, but the

requirement that the Bank Act shall come before Parliament for revision every ten years is still the fundamental piece of control. Each situation has been met in and for itself, not according to some general rule. It follows that the argument often heard that the CBC should not be the control authority for broadcasting while it is itself a broadcasting medium is not necessarily valid. Everything depends on the circumstances of the particular case. It is not the object of this brief to investigate, as a principal topic, the question of control, that is, whether there should be a separate authority or not, but a brief reference is made to this topic in Point Ten of the addendum. To the writer the question does not seem to be of major importance, since the CBC in its broadcasting aspect and in its regulating aspect is virtually two separate bodies. The problem should be approached on its merits and if it can be shown that the Regulating Authority in the CBC has been unjust to private broadcasting, then injustices should be prevented in the future. The writer cannot forbear noting, however, that in his knowledge, the CBC has been unfair, not to the private stations but to itself and to the public. A stiffer body of control and regulation might therefore be an advantage.

Now, as to the question of costs, each venture into public control has cost a great deal of money. Who could calculate the costs to the public of building the Canadian Pacific

Railway or the later two transcontinentals? Think of the millions and millions that were poured into the Canadian National in the twenty years after its formation. So costly was this system that there was a period in the 1920's when there was grave danger of its being lost to the public altogether. And yet when the time for decision came, under the late Prime Minister R. B. Bennett, authorities could not bring themselves to count the cost in dollars and decided to maintain the C.N.R. as a public system -- by that period the C.P.R. had long since been on its feet, but every historian knows that it too had been mainly a creation of the Canadian State and that, in the 1880's it had been the object of just the same kind of controversy on money expended upon it as the C.N.R. was to be in the 1920's and 1930's.

The truth of the matter is, these huge undertakings of a country like this can only be done if the country places its entire weight behind them, and that means that the State must go into it.

If the cost to the public of the railways of Canada could be calculated, and that is virtually impossible, it is quite out of the question to calculate the cost of the National Policy. This is a highly complex and controversial area, and it is not proposed to enter here upon it. But the very fact that manufacturers would not willingly forego the protection afforded them

by the tariff is prima facie evidence of the expense that the tariff imposes upon each individual citizen. We would have to get the differential in price on all articles made under the tariff from 1878 on and multiply that by the number of articles made in order to get some approximation of the monetary cost of the National Policy. The resulting figures would be staggering. We accept them because we know they are part of the price we pay for continued national existence.

The same situation applies to nearly all the other enterprises mentioned above with the exception of publicly owned electric power systems.

These facts are put down in order to show that the cost of radio and television broadcasting cannot in themselves be regarded as definitive answers to the wisdom of maintaining the public system. The cost has never been the determining factor in our Canadian experiment. Naturally, we have had to keep costs within reason -- though reason is a large word and it may, in certain cases, as defence, stretch to astronomical proportions -- but money costs alone have not been the determining factors. There is no reason, then, for dismay at the large annual costs for public television and broadcasting. These are what we must expect, along with highways. It simply comes down to this, that if we are going to have a separate existence we must pay for it and probably pay heavily for it.

The next point is the high degree of

dependence of our national existence upon radio and television. It is conceivable that Canada could still continue to exist if, instead of taking the train at Montreal and going right through to Winnipeg north of the Lakes, the passenger took the train at Montreal, went on through to Chicago, and thence up to Winnipeg. But there is a realm more subtle and probably more important than the physical realm of railways, and it is that of ideas. Radio and television are essentially devices for the communication of ideas. Now, ideas may be of any order of complexity. Over television we can recreate the old moving picture comedy of one man throwing pies at another. That is a species of the communication of both pies and ideas, and it is perhaps not very important. But there is another way of looking at it, whereby perhaps it becomes quite important, in that it helps to form the mentality of the persons who see the pies thrown. We all know the vast medium of propaganda the American "movie" has been. Through the movie, the United States has, up to a considerable point, Americanized the entire world. No country has been able to resist the American movie: it is even shown in Russia, and it has, of course, been completely impossible for us to restrain its effects on our Canadian population. Nothing has brought Canada closer to being a reflection of the United States than has the American movie. In moulding our characters and outlook, it has probably been more important than all the railways and the tariffs, all the national anthems, all the

images on coins.

Television will repeat the story of the movie, but on a far more intimate scale, for it is carrying ideas, from pie-throwing upward, into every hearth and home. The major question Canadians will have to confront in the future is as to whether these ideas shall be American or Canadian. No one would be so foolish as to argue for a kind of Chinese wall against other countries, and it may quite safely be predicted that whatever we in Canada do will be in accordance with our national qualities -- that is, it will be something moderate in its nature. On the other hand, everyone must agree that there must be some reasonable attention paid to our own national interests. This has been the unconscious rule we have stumbled on in all the instances which have been described above, and it would seem only proper to apply it to this latest case, perhaps the most important of all. We do not wish to take a rather silly "holier than thou" attitude towards our neighbours, neither do we wish to be dominated by them. In television, as in other areas, the only commendable attitude is one of independence.

Now it could be argued that if we had no public television at all, the tastes of Canadians would automatically provide the kind of selection we wished, providing us with a good class of programmes taken over from American production studios. This, it seems to me, would at least be undignified, and, of course, in reality we would have little opportunity to select the kind of programmes that come to us from the south. Everyone knows that in practically every aspect of our national life so far, we have taken what our American friends have been pleased to give us. For example, in what particular have automobiles been modified to meet peculiar Canadian conditions? We take the models with which we are supplied. It might be that we would find news services from Europe more congenial to our Canadian temperament than we do the American news services. There has been a certain amount of interest in this country in films produced in Europe, particularly in the British Isles. The point we try to make here is that it is not to be taken for granted that Canadian tastes and requirements are the same as American. One of the strongest arguments for keeping firm control of our airwaves, springs from the fact that we have our own conditions to meet and that therefore we must be in control of a certain minimum area of our national life. It may be said that nobody is suggesting that we should abandon the national radio and television services, allowing these to drift into American hands.

I think since this brief was prepared that statement would have to be changed because

I notice that one brief suggested just exactly that.

It is to be hoped that nobody is suggesting this but the point is not that someone is actively trying to secure the abandonment of our public radio and television but that the effect of weakening our public services would eventually be to throw more power, more control, and stronger financial structure into hands that sooner or later would come to be under American control.

Now, we do not see any nefarious and conscious attempt on the part of our American friends to take over Canadian television. The point is that American interests are so powerful, in whatever direction one looks, whether it be manufacturing, prospecting for and developing oil wells, building gas pipelines, the movies, publications of all sorts, or in any other direction, that it probably would turn out that they would take over our public airwaves, hardly knowing they were doing it. This has been the course by which American branch plants have been substituted all over Canada for native Canadian industries. There is no reason to think that the airwaves, where in private hands, are any exception to this general rule.

A good example of the way in which creative initiative is shifting "across the line" -- largely through the negligence of the CBC authorities -- was offered by a programme transmitted by a certain radio station on Sunday, March 4, 1956, between the hours of eight and nine o'clock p.m., Eastern Standard Time. (It must be remembered that if initiative

shifts southward, executive control will follow it). This is during the period in which CBC National Network programmes are supposed to be broadcast over this particular station. Instead, the station puts on, by means of a record, it is to be presumed, a programme from Chicago. No exception could be taken to the programme in itself, which consisted in a religious service put out by "The Christian Reform Church" on "The Back to God Hour" -- personally, the title made me squirm, but I just quote it -- Box 773, Chicago, Illinois. A sermon was preached and some music sung: the sermon was well delivered and not sensational. At the end of the broadcast listeners were invited to write to the "Back to God Hour", Box 773, Chicago, for copies of "The Listener's Digest". This sort of thing goes on endlessly; it is in the area of "common knowledge": another example of it occurs over the same station each Sunday night at 10.30.

Many programmes of this sort have rather objectionable advertising: the above example is given as one of the best of its type and to make this point: namely, that despite its relatively high standard, it was entirely American in its associations (except in that, of course, it was also a typical Protestant service) and ended up with a request to write to Box 773, Chicago, Ill., directed to the listeners in the Canadian district in which it was broadcasted in exactly the same terms as if it were being given in Chicago itself.

Some will say, "What of it, if the programme was intrinsically all right?" Simply that if a Canadian society is to be maintained it must be maintained in Canadian terms, -- and it is surely coming to a pretty pass if we cannot preach our own sermons! Therefore the amount of sapping and mining permitted private interests in this way must in some manner be limited. Private selfishness would erode the rock of Canadian nationalism into dust. Nothing is sacred to the man who is trying to turn a penny.

At this point, perhaps we should say that we ought to have some separate control authority which would control this, because it seems impossible for the CBC to do this job. It seems to me it is properly subject to a very considerable degree of criticism for its failure in this respect. Perhaps we should have some higher seat, above it, which would not be free to discipline the private stations.

Another example of the disregard both of national interests and CBC requirements lies in the omission by the station referred to to carry the annual CBC week of Canadian Institute of Public Affairs "Couchiching Conference" broadcasts. For some reason unknown to the writer, during this week of important national broadcasts, broadcasts which are informative, well-delivered and influential, and full reports of which are carried in the daily press, the station in question "gets away with" sending out an hour of cheap fare, mainly in the form of recorded material. I don't know how many of the private stations do the same thing

at the same time. I can speak for one. Hundreds of people every year attend the Couchiching Conference, and it has become a national institution important in our national life. The CBC now carries the cream of it to a wide national audience. Yet there is one fairly important private station, and there may be others, which simply disregards it. If there was no national radio, such cases make it quite plain that there would be no national medium of broadcasting: with relatively minor exceptions, we would be confined to sorry reproduction of American material.

In the light of the above, one of the points we wish to make is that the CBC authorities should be required to see that the law is obeyed: that is their duty, and they are evidently not doing it.

Let me repeat that just as we have had to use the power of the state to maintain control of certain key factors in other areas, so we must use the power of the state to maintain control of our television and radio. And let it be emphasized once more, the primary consideration is not cost but national existence.

Now I would like to take another line here on page 10, the Constitutional Angle: The question may also be viewed from a constitutional angle. The Canadian Confederation consists of ten provinces, each one of which has local autonomy. Canadian history since Confederation has had as one of its major aspects the constant see-saw battle between the powers of the provinces and the powers of the Dominion. Each of our provinces has its own needs,

and to some degree, its own manner of life. Some provinces favour this attitude, others that. There is much diversity, much healthy variety in the life of Canada, as we go from Atlantic coast to the Pacific. This is as it should be and makes for an interesting country. But there is also the country, the common country. Canada is not merely the sum of ten provinces placed side by side. It is a unity,an integer. Our citizenship is the citizenship of Canada: we are Canadian citizens. Now to maintain a common citizenship over a widely dispersed country we must use every device at our command. It is altogether too easy for our people to slide off into a localism which if it were to go to its logical limits would shiver the country into atoms. And no wonder when we think of the enormous distances we have to contend with in this country and our thin population.

One of the most powerful of all instruments in keeping a society together, in making it conscious of itself, in providing it with common views, attitudes and ideas, is the spoken word. By the device of the spoken word, even more than by the device of the transcontinental railroads, we have made Canada. There is no doubt but that we shall have to go on into an indefinite future building the country by the same device, the spoken word. But we can no more afford to have the media for transmitting the spoken word entirely in private hands than we could afford to have our defence forces in private hands. Our defence

forces are the visible medium of the state's existence. They are the visible guarantee of the state's existence as against other states and as against internal dissension. But the existence of a state such as ours, whose essence is self-government, depends not only on physical media but also in the much more subtle area indicated by such words as discussion, debate, consensus of opinion.

The best dictum on the necessity of safeguarding freedom of expression is probably to be found in the ruling on the celebrated Alberta Press law, made by the Supreme Court of Canada in the late 1930's. It will be remembered that the Court in that case held that one of the necessary conditions of Canadian life was freedom of discussion and that the Alberta Press law by attempting to control the press in that province, infringed freedom of discussion and thereby injured the total fabric of Canadian life. Now just as there are dangers from interference with the freedom of the press, so there must be dangers from interference with the freedom of the airwaves. The two media are different in their nature, as has often been pointed out, in that there is a limit to the number of airwaves, with the consequence that there is a monopolistic aspect about radio and television which does not exactly apply to the press, though it is to be noted that the monopolistic element in the daily press is becoming larger and larger so that many fairly large cities now have only one daily paper. When local monopoly in

journalism is joined to local radio or television monopoly, a dangerous concentration of power over public discussion ensues. It is submitted that this Commission might properly consider whether it is in the best interests of Canada to permit the common ownership, either directly or indirectly, of newspapers and broadcasting stations.

It would probably be better in the long run for the newspapers themselves if in the sphere of ownership and control they had nothing to do with radio and television.

At first sight, the public radio and television would appear to lend itself to monopoly and private systems to make for competition; the analogy between a free press and a free system of private broadcasting and television seems to be fairly close. But the analogy is rather superficial, mainly because of the much greater element of monopoly imposed by the nature of the medium. The consequence is that private broadcasting comes out to something very much like a monopoly, too, at least for local areas. The whole large problem of the allocation of air wave lengths and television channels which necessitates communications commissions even in such laisser-faire countries as the United States, has often been discussed and it is hardly necessary to go over it in detail in this brief. The simple fact is that with us here in Canada private control would really be a kind of monopoly, whereas the public medium is kept free by public interest and vigilance.

At the present time it is not, but there is always danger in any public medium such as CBC, and it is only in so far as our public is intelligent and vigilant and is interested, that the CBC itself will not become dangerous. Everything depends on our public.

The point is perhaps not overly important, for private stations not having the monopoly of an

area do not and would not differ essentially from those that do. Private stations could never provide a national medium of communication, simply because they are local. If at some future time, chains of private stations were built up, these would soon come under the domination of the American chains, or, if they maintained a brief independence, they would no more cater to national interest and national discussion than do "the movies": in fact, "the movies" are probably a better analogy for private radio than is the press. The press has a long and honourable tradition to maintain: it is not all we would wish it to be, but no newspaper has the impersonality of a radio station. A newspaper may be compared to a person coming into your home, with the responsibilities attaching to him. A radio station is more like the open window of a house on the street -- all kinds of voices float up and are heard through it. Scores of comparisons and contrasts between the various media of communication may be made, but our purpose here is a much narrower one -- that of stressing the necessity of public radio and television.

Owing to the nature of this country, we must ensure for ourselves, most people would agree (the Supreme Court of Canada included), a national medium of discussion. Before the development of broadcasting, we relied for our national medium of discussion on the daily press and for years it served us well, though by no means perfectly. But since the rise of broadcasting we no longer rely entirely on the press. We are coming more and more to rely on broadcasting and

television. It is obvious then that a national medium for national discussion is of the first importance.

It is not desired here to limit the scope of the word discussion. Discussion may take many forms: there may be direct talks, discussion groups such as the well-known programme on the CBC called "Citizens' Forum", and other types. It is probably not stretching the word too far to include under it such items as the daily news service; anything in short which enables people to have information on which to base judgments may be called discussion. The term is used perhaps mainly with respect to public topics but also not to the exclusion of daily fare: foreign policy is a valid topic for public discussion but so is hockey, so, under limited circumstances at any rate, are ladies' hats. Discussion is a large term: let us make sure that we have as much of it as possible, especially when it relates to topics that interest large numbers of people in all parts of the country.

Now some consideration of our present national media of this country: first of all, the press, briefly:

-

-

-

Since discussion is the lifeblood of a free country, it is necessary for that country in its collective capacity to take steps to secure the opportunities for discussion. It is submitted and this is by no means the first time, that the point has been made, that if our broadcasting arrangements did not provide for the operation of some public agency, then discussion on a nationwide basis would become difficult and might become impossible.

In Canada we have never been well provided with national means of communication. Thus our press services are local rather than national though in our domestic affairs it may be agreed our press has served us well. In respect to Commonwealth and international affairs, the picture is not so bright, for there our dependence on outside sources has been not far from complete. The Canadian press gives only a limited coverage in this type of news and it does not seem to avail itself of the services of reporters whose training is equal to the complexities of the situations they face. For analysis, political, social and economic, as contrasted with human interest situations, our newspapers depend on such services as the Associated Press. There have been of course, conspicuous exceptions. Nor can many of our papers maintain correspondents abroad. Some of them attempt, more or less irrugularly, to maintain men in London and Washington and such correspondenets have done useful work. Despite this, the generalization will stand that Canadians do not get from the Canadian daily press news despatches a distinctively Canadian view

of world affairs.

A "brigade" in the Canadian army becomes in most of our newspapers a "regimental combat team", which indicates the source of the dispatch; that is, it is an American dispatch presented to Canadian readers without a change.

So far does this go that in such exclusively "family" affairs as meetings of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers in London, the interpretive despatches which appear in Canadian newspapers are usually from American sources.

The press may well counter the above line of reasoning by pointing to its editorial services and to the work of such men as Mr. Norman Smith of the Ottawa Journal, whose despatches from Russia and the report of whose speeches after his return, provided Canadians not only with a vivid picture of modern Russia but with one seen through Canadian eyes. The present brief is not written with any desire to make a case against the Canadian newspaper, far from that; its objective is simply to try to analyse the existing situation. I recognize the good work which our journalists do, especially in such areas as editorial discussion. In level our press compares more than favourably with the newspapers of both the United States and Great Britain. It is, however, subject to financial and other limitations which make it, in this important area of international news, far more dependent upon outside sources of news than from the standpoint of good citizenship is desirable.

And indeed, of comment and analysis. However good the political critics of Great Britain and the United States may be, they cannot take the place of men who interpret events for their own people. Some of our newspapers avail themselves of the news services of the New York Times, others the London Observer. This is excellent, but it is different indeed from material written by Canadians for Canadians.

Now it is worthy of note that there is a group of journalists in this country whose analysis of the foreign scene will in acuteness of perception compare well with those from any other source and that at the same time nearly all these men get a much extended range by reason of the fact that their voices are often heard over our national networks. If we did not have the national networks, their voices would not be heard: instead, private stations would find it cheaper to "buy" "canned" comment from a syndicated American source. It can be shown, by instance after instance, both in the field of journalism and of literary culture generally, that a purely commerical attitude smothers native talent. One example may be given:- some years ago, the editor of the Saturday edition of a great paper remarked that he could "buy" stories in the New York market much more cheaply than locally, these stories being sold to many papers at the same time. He therefore bought them. As a consequence, his weekly edition might almost just as well have been published in Miami, Florida, as in a Canadian city.

In happy contrast stand such national

magazines as MacLeans and Week-End, which after years of struggle, are successfully providing Canadians with Canadian fare. Anyone who knows the uphill struggle of our periodical press, continued in some instances literally for decades, will agree at once that the possibilities of genuine Canadian programming on the part of private radio and television interests, programming which would involve much greater costs than periodical publishing, and which would call for even more devotion to the national interest, are not great. As these words are written, a local radio station is sending out book reviews relating to the American scene, for Americans, in American terms. These are being read by the local announcer just as if he were down in Texas; all the terms of reference are American. These reviews it is presumed, are bought from some central service and put out without regard to their American application. Their level, though not high, cannot be objected to, but this is no way to build a nation. It is evident that the major motivation behind private broadcasting and television, the dominating motive, is profit.

To return to the press and the question of international affairs: the public system of broadcasting provides us with a prospect of getting our own picture of the outside world. Almost nightly we can hear excellent reports by Canadians from London, Washington and Paris. And we can hear excellent comment upon the world situation given by specialists here at home. It is not too much to say that already the public system has gone far in the direction of

giving to Canadians the opportunity of judging the trend of world affairs for themselves. This opportunity will go farther.

It cannot be too much emphasized that the alternative to a Canadian view of the world is not some kind of disembodied internationalism, but an American view. All that can be said about this is that if the Canadian people desire to become American, then that is their right.

But we should not slide easily and imperceptibly down into the American gulf: we should know what we are doing and where we are going.

In particular, I believe that we should not drift into being Americans, delightful as that prospect might well be, simply to suit the convenience and enlarge the profits of those who have no national vision.

Once again, I have no objection to my friends across the line, and I have been to an American university; I have excellent friends there with the kindest of relationships and very great sympathy but after all, I was born and brought up in this country and I feel I have a right to my country just as they have a right to theirs.

In other words, I believe that Canadians in the mass wish to remain Canadians and are aware that it will in the future, as in the past, cost them money for the privilege. I believe, moreover, that as the country grows and becomes economically sounder, these costs will decrease. I believe that the fight for a national system of broadcasting is just one aspect of the fight for separate existence which Canadians have been waging ever since the American Revolution. I believe that the average Canadian, quite without malice towards his neighbour, wishes to go on waging that fight.

The next is a short description under the heading "Discussion of domestic affairs not possible on national basis without a national radio".

What has been said about external affairs, applies with still greater force to domestic. We must have our domestic medium of discussion: that point has already been made. But how could we possibly have it unless we had a national system of communication? If, for example, an address to the nation is to be made by the Prime Minister of the day, how is he to make it except through the medium of a national system? Is it conceivable that any private system could ever be built up into a national system in this way? It is submitted, on the contrary, that as private stations grow more powerful, the irresistible tendencies with them, as with so many other Canadian industries, and they are industries, will be for them to be turned into branches of the corresponding American broadcasting industry. If other sectors of our economy are unable to withstand "branch-plantization", if I may coin a word, is it reasonable to assume that broadcasting and television can?

The only guarantee of continued national existence is the continued nationalization of the key-sectors of our national life, of which radio and television is one.

Now another heading, and I don't know how long you wish me to go on, until what time you wish me to continue --

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask you a personal question. Are you planning to stay over?

MR. LOWER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will tell you what our

problem is. We have a one-page brief to be presented by an organization where the presenter has to read it and if you can stay until tomorrow it may act as an intervention. I think we could pick it up again, we might be able to take this other very short brief and then go on for a little while this afternoon and resume in the morning with you. You have been going on now for 14 pages of reading. Would you like to take a breather? This is a one-page brief and we could take it now and I understand the people have to get back to London for a meeting tomorrow and then we could go on again with yours.

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF CONSUMERS

Appearances:

Mrs. W.B. Harvey — Provincial President

Mrs. G.M. Graban

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a slightly informal and unusual method of proceeding Mrs. Harvey, but I understand you have to be back in London for a meeting tomorrow and if that is the case I think we will take your brief now and we will mark it as Exhibit 208 and this gives Dr. Lower a chance to draw his breath for a few minutes anyway.

---EXHIBIT NO. 208: Brief presented by Canadian Association of Consumers.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a one-page brief and would you care to read it Mrs. Harvey?

MRS. HARVEY: Thank you Mr. Fowler, I had planned rather to speak a little to the brief which you have had now for several months and then come back to the brief, if there is any point in doing so. If it is your wish I will read the brief instead.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, you go ahead and do it any way way you wish. We have read the brief so it is not necessary for you to read it.

MRS. HARVEY: I would just like to mention the brief of our Ontario branch of the Canadian Association of Consumers is based on a brief of the provincial branch committee made by Mrs. P.M. Kennedy of Toronto. Mrs. Kennedy was not able to be present so I will do the best I can but I am not nearly as well informed as Mrs. Kennedy. I am Mrs. Harvey of London, provincial president of the Ontario branch. We have about half the members of the national C.A.C. in Canada. We have now, in Ontario some 11,150 members. Of these 7,150 are largely urban and the other 4,000 entirely rural. They belong to rural groups who join as groups. Our branches vary in size from 50 to 1,600 so we have branches in little places like Ingersol and St. Thomas and also in London and Toronto. This brief was discussed at our annual meeting in May when there were 20 individual members there and represented all of our branches with the exception of the lakehead. As you will have seen from our brief our members are asking for more information on economic and consumer

products. I would like to stress the fact that our members are asking for this. It is not the executive deciding what they should have. This comes from members all over the country. I attend the meetings in large and small branches. I attend meetings where all these consumer problems are brought out and discussed and these are the things that members are asking for that I mention. I should like to emphasize too when these members of the Canadian Consumers Association come to our meeting they don't want entertainment. They are very vocal when we put on entertainment to work up our membership. They come very seriously demanding more information on consumer products.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you applying that to radio and television Mrs. Harvey because there is a public taste, and even a public demand for programmes to make people think.

MRS. HARVEY: They particularly ask for discussion programmes. The reason I say they ask, they ask why we are not influential in having them put on the air, why are we not putting them on? Why don't we get on programmes that will have the information they require?

THE CHAIRMAN: The reason we are interrupting, we have had a great deal of evidence across the country which seems to point to the fact that people look to radio and television for entertainment and a lot of people are suggesting the more serious types of programme are, in fact, not listened to. You are representing the consumers who are, in fact, a wide body

of opinion in this country but I take it you would not agree with it.

MRS. HARVEY: I would not agree with it but I want to point out there is a large body represented by this consumer group. They are vocal and they are saying what a great many women who do not belong would like to say.

MR. deGRANDPRE: There have been some changes since this brief was written because there was a discussion of a consumer report just last week.

MRS. HARVEY: Do you mean it has been effective already. (Laughter).

THE CHAIRMAN: No one can say the CBC does not respond.

MRS. HARVEY: Our members want to know the facts about national economics. I had the word simple but I took it out. There is the word simple in the brief. They want to know about tariffs and government controls and inflationary trends so they can come to some decision and discuss it amongst themselves. They want the facts behind it as well as the facts behind these consumer commodities they want to know all about the new electrical equipment and the new synthetics -- how to wash them -- that is, they are interested in all phases of consumer information on a sort of long-range national basis. They want to know about national economics. And they want to know why the price of things should be what it is. It has been suggested that the detailed consumer information be given by daytime TV and radio programmes which are

heard mostly by women. Women are the daytime listeners. And that the explanation and information regarding all national economy and so on be given in the evening programmes for the whole family; the man and woman, I am thinking of. Although women do the buying it is largely as a result of family consultation and decision. All of them have indicated they would like better programmes dealing with finance, health and law as well as detailed consumer problems. This lack of high level radio and television programmes reflect what the planners think of their daytime audience and at times women might be critical of that estimate. We are appreciative for the many good CBC programmes of consumer interest. Trans-Canada Matinee, is very popular and a programme of a very high order.

The Ruth Harding programme, which deals with consumer information and it is listened to by a very great many of our members. They are always quoting Ruth Harding to me. Then there is Open House, Safety Programme -- especially the part dealing with rackets, Citizens Forum, Farm Forum. This is the kind of thing we like. There is a definite need even for something in the nature of a consumer's forum to reach and inform the people of anything regarding the whole economy of Canada. It is possible to take out a good deal of this information by getting the bulletins from the Department of Agriculture and studying it but they are asking for it on radio and TV.

I should like to emphasize the need of having some women in the formation of CBC policy. That is,

women members on the CBC Board.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is one now.

MRS. HARVEY: Yes, we commend the CBC for what they are doing now and we would like more just as we would like more of these programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just before you leave this, what about musical programmes? I know there are certain types of fairly long programmes with certain types of music. Have you any idea at all if those are, in fact, listened to?

MRS. HARVEY: Yes, they are listened to by the same type of person who would pay a dollar and join the CBC consumer organization.

I would like you to go to about three inches from the end of the brief and I will read it. We would urge also that CBC explore the possibilities of daytime TV programmes to educate the consumer's taste in industrial design, just as we have seen over the years how radio has improved the public taste in music, drama and reading and literature.

And that has been done because a great many turn to those programmes and do enjoy them. There is no question in my mind about that because of getting around the provinces I know that and being with the groups, large and small, I get the reflection of their thinking.

Just the end. The members who were preparing this brief asked me to put this in particularly. We have had good commissions studying our various problems with their resultant report. We now hope

that this Commission might inform and influence public opinion so that there will be some implementation of the recommendations at a very early date. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think we can do anything about the implementation.

MRS. HARVEY: I pointed that out but they said I should say something about implementation.

MR. deGRANDPRE: There is just one point I have not covered as you went along and were talking about the daytime programmes of consumer's problems. We have had the suggestion that instead of expanding the time of the programmes or the programme schedule we should try and restrict ourselves and give, not so much quantity but quality and don't you feel that these consumer programmes would have achieved a better result or would have a wider audience if those programmes were given at night instead of during the daytime when the housewife is busy.

-

-

-

-

MRS. HARVEY: May I just say this, since I am representing the members rather than giving my own opinion, our members resent the type of programme they get during the day for the "Little Housewife" who is rather stupid anyway, there is that attitude. They want good programmes during the day since they are for the women, they are the daytime listeners but, as I mentioned a few minutes ago, they would like to have good consumer material on the evening programmes because the men and women of the family are interested in knowing more and having better consumer information in order that they might buy better for themselves and it would be better for the economy.

MR. deGRANDPRE: That is what I had in mind, these good programmes should be broadcast in the evening when the husband and wife can listen with attention to the programmes and discuss these problems together instead of during the daytime when you cannot concentrate on the material over the air.

MRS. HARVEY: Yes, if they were talking about the price of eggs and what you are doing about washing sheets and so forth if they are discussing the inflationary trend today and what influences it and how the intelligent consumer can be of value, as they were doing the way when we were working closely with the government and helping the national economy. They want that kind of thing.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I did not introduce my associate at the beginning. I would like to introduce Mrs. Graban our past president

and executive of the National and Mrs. Plumptre who is National vice-president. These ladies may have information on parts of our work that I have not.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Harvey, I have one question to ask; you make a request, speaking on behalf of your consumers for programmes of an economic information type but who does your organization suggest should or can supply these programmes?

MRS. HARVEY: I was hoping we might be asked that question. I should like to see, and I am speaking only as an individual, I am not free to commit the national or even my provincial executive, but I should like to see the Canadian Association of Consumers which is really the voice of the Canadian consumer and the only authentic voice of the Canadian consumer in Canada, I should like to see that group called up perhaps in a question and answer programme, perhaps a panel of our national presidents, take all our presidents in all the provinces, the president of some executive. The kind of programmes that we are putting on with farm groups where you have labour and business representatives and the farmer and the consumer discussing the problems from all the angles. These panels we are having more of each year, we speak and have a panel at the Perth county annual meeting, at the regional meeting in Woodstock, at the Ontario Federation of Agriculture in Toronto, that type of meeting. In Toronto one year they asked us why we buy where we buy and that would have made a magnificant programme and the stores,

the department stores and the small merchant would have been very glad to have that information and it would have been thought-provoking for consumers.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was thinking of it in a different way to that, I took it perhaps wrongly that you were mainly thinking in terms of programmes being provided by the CBC.

MRS. HARVEY: Mr. Fowler, this just came to me on the spur of the moment and I was speaking as an individual. What our brief is asking is that the CBC put on better and more serious programmes on economic subjects and consumer information.

THE CHAIRMAN: The reason behind my question was, we have heard a good deal from private broadcasters that they are very responsive to public opinion, that they are giving the public what it wants and they are in the position to do so. Now, if there is this demand that you speak of for this type of programme, in your view would this be something that the private stations could do?

MRS. HARVEY: I should like to see both doing it. I might say this, that the private stations in Ontario, the private radio and TV seem to be wide open for our material but our people are overworked and we cannot give them all the material they want. The press, the radio and TV find our material good copy, people want to read it but we have not succeeded so far. This is a weakness in our organization, we have not been able to work long enough ourselves to give people what they are

asking for. I do not ever remember having a programme refused on the radio or TV that we suggested. We have the toy testing, a member of our toy testing department was on one of the previous groups this afternoon, that makes an excellent programme and any time we are willing to get the toys and give the information over the air it makes an excellent TV programme and the stations will take it if we will give it to them. We know they are anxious to have our programmes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: We are living in a country of various economies, they vary from province to province and some of the topics which you are talking of might be put on television and may not lend themselves to national broadcasting in that the topic discussed in Newfoundland would have no response in say Alberta. For instance, there are certain topics that would lend themselves to the local situation rather than the national. I think that is what Mr. Fowler is referring to when he asked whether you were making the request particularly to the CBC or whether you had tried the private stations.

MRS. HARVEY: I agree with you. Could it be possible that there are certain topics like tariff the farm subsidies, as I refer to these sort of groupings, these things that benefit Canada as a whole would be national and I am sure there would be some things that would be on Ontario stations that would not interest those in British Columbia.

However, we would like to see these programmes in British Columbia and Ontario divided to fit the situation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Harvey, we are very grateful to you for coming and having prepared this brief and presenting it to us in this way. We did hear the brief of your parent body in Montreal and we now have a very good idea of the views of the Canadian consumers. Thank you very much.

Dr. Lower, if you are agreeable, we would like to go on with the reading of your brief. I think perhaps we will defer the questioning until tomorrow morning and if you feel yourself getting exhausted, do not hesitate to say so.

MR. LOWER: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: I believe we had gotten as far as page 14 today to the section marked "Broadcasting and the question of areas".

MR. LOWER: Yes, I will go on from there.

There is another, and important, field of consideration which leads us to the same conclusion, and to examine it, it is necessary to examine briefly the whole question of values. We may ask simply "what is worth while?" "What kind of public existence, what kin d of private existence is worth while?" "What are the objectives of life?" "What are the ideals of our state and of our society?" These are large questions, but if we neglect consideration of them, we do so at our peril, for half the world today is dominated by regimes

which have the most definite of ideas as to "what it is all about" and what the values are which people should seek. The average man does not seem to realize it, but we are in a period of great religious warfare, the warfare between west and east, between ourselves and communism. In the face of this epic contest, our own little wants and personal ambitions shrivel into matters of small significance. We hear constant talk about "the democracies", "the western world", "the free world", "our way of life", and so on. We hear, it must be admitted, extremely little explanation of what all these fine phrases amount to.

There is substantial agreement that "our way of life" is better than the communist way of life but is there a clear answer as to why it is better? The average man would no doubt answer quite simply "because we live in a free country". That is a satisfactory answer, too, providing the average man has some conception of the meaning of the words "free country". If he interprets these words in a wide sense to mean not only personal liberty, but freedom of discussion, freedom of opportunity, and similar matters, then his stand is rational and broad. If he interprets them in a narrow way, "freedom to do as I like", "freedom to make money", then, his stand at least needs examination. Unfortunately in our age, freedom, thanks to the overwhelming impact upon us of modern technical achievement, seems to mean the freedom of material things. The free world of the west, so to speak, is the world where any man, however humble, can go out and buy a good used car. Under the sheer

weight of material things, every educator and religious leader will tell you, it becomes harder and harder to get people to see and appreciate the underlying abstractions, the underlying philosophical values, upon which our western material achievements rest. Material things become ends in themselves, and the opium of the people turns out to be, not religion, but mechanical appliances!

Now the bearing of this upon public broadcasting is apparent: if we allow the commerical aspects of broadcasting to dominate, then we greatly decrease the opportunities for presenting the kind of programme upon which depends the maintenance of public attitudes inspired by something better than mere selfishness. We must not forget that the airwaves are to be ranked, not with an ordinary business, but with the theatre, the press, the public platform, the public museum and art gallery, the school, the university and the church. It is true that there are elements of commercialism in all these great institutions: conspicuously so in the theatre but even, in a certain degree, in the church, for the church must keep itself solvent and must make a worldly success of itself as an institution, in addition to conserving its spiritual objectives. Students must pay fees, public museums cannot go on without cash, and so on. But in all these, the cash nexus is subordinate. It has been prominent, but not dominant, in both the theatre and the press, yet, nevertheless, what distinguishes both these institutions from ordinary commercial undertakings is the fact that they are based to some degree upon objectives

other than commercial, and in proportion as they become mere commercial projects, they lose the high place which society has accorded them.

Can private broadcasting be added to the public institutions of communication named above? So far its objectives seem to have been merely commercial. But the domination by the commercial attitude of a great public service such as broadcasting is equivalent to its prostitution. It is as much the prostitution of a public institution if it is employed a profession when a doctor performs, for money, an illegal operation. The only way of ensuring that broadcasting shall be conducted upon an institutional level comparable with that of other institutions named above is to ensure a strong public system, and then leave it to public criticism to keep this system healthy.

The argument is sometimes advanced that "good" programmes get poor audiences. The assumption is allowed to slip out that "what the public wants" is unlimited cheap music, sports. etc. In the last short brief we had a repition of that.

No doubt the CBC as an organization will present evidence to the Commission on this point: it is in a position to do so, and if inquiry is pressed, what will come out is that some of its "good" programmes, consisting of, say, discussion, or good drama, or authentic news reports and criticism, have excellent listening audiences, some of them ranking up among the few at the top. The assumption that private stations would "give the public what it wants" is by no means warranted. There is a case cited in which a private station was offered a broadcast of the world baseball series, surely "what the public wants" -- and that is surely what the public wants at this time of year -- and tried to get out of taking it, simply because the series interfered with the local advertising it could put on at the same time. It is not what the public wants. It is what pays, of course, that is the criterion here.

The issue of "good programmes" versus "popular programmes" should be faced. No one will suggest that a mass audience wishes to sit all evening and every evening listening to grand opera or to high philosophical discussion. And only those who make the mistake of consistently under-rating the intelligence of Canadian audiences will claim

that "what the public wants" is the cheapest and poorest kind of material. This is the mistake that the moving picture industry of the United States is supposed constantly to have made -- under-rating its audiences, pitching its films to the mentality of an underdeveloped child, coming down heavily on sex, and so on. Anyone can see this mistake writ large on the "movie" advertising pages of any daily newspaper: here are letterpress and pictures conceived in low and vulgar terms, supposed to be "what the public wants". And anyone who knows Canadian life knows that these advertisements are alien to it: they reflect another society, with different habits and ethics from our own. No doubt any society can be persuaded without too much difficulty to accept large helpings of sex in its daily diet, but that is different from asserting that these are "what the public wants". The Canadian public in all probability no more wants overdoses of Hollywood sex than it wants boring repetitions of "westerns"; the cowboy was never the folk figure of Canadians as he was of Americans; he has been imposed on us, along with the bulbous heroine, the so-called "comic" book, the half-nude ladies who decorate the magazine racks of the average drug store and all the other rubbish which comes to us from the semi-submerged areas of American life. The Canadian people, as those who have spent their lives trying to understand them know, are conservative, they do not crave much excitement: in a dozen different ways, their psychology is different from that of the great city populations to the south. Much of what is served up to them in the way of "popular culture"

is, for them, an acquired taste.

If an example of difference in social mores is needed, one stares us in the face, namely the differing attitudes towards divorce in the two countries. The Canadian attitude is conservative and restrained. In general, we do not approve of divorce. The result is that our divorce rate is much lower than that of the United States. American individualism in this most important area, as in others, outweighs social considerations, with the result that the social device, marriage, gives way to individual desire, namely divorce. American culture, especially in its cheaper, "popular" varieties, reflects this individualism of the American temperament, divorce included, and Canadians get the benefit of it by reason of the flood of agencies which circulate American concepts among us, "movie" advertisements therein included. To this private radio and television cannot possibly constitute an exception.

On the other hand there is at least a fighting chance that if the government of the day, parliament and a sufficient proportion of the Canadian people are willing to make a fight for public radio and television, however expensive these may prove in dollars and cents, the flood may be restrained, and some portion of our cultural and spiritual life be recaptured for ourselves. Since the weight of this mass American culture is so great, it is admittedly only a fighting chance, but it is probably our last chance. In nearly every area of the great formative mediums we have hitherto surrendered, with the result that our own

values have become more and more submerged. If a nation has no individuality, no character, it is hard to see why it should continue to exist, or how. There seems to be no good reason for our continuing the terrific expense of maintaining a national government at Ottawa, if we are simply so many Americans. We must either exist in our own right, with our own way of life, or sooner or later cease to exist -- and that is, of course, where it seems to me radio and television come in in the most strategic of all ways.

Moreover unless we can create a culture of our own, this country will continue to be a fit home, not for heroes, but for second bests. No really first rate man wishes to be associated with a second rate concern. As long as we are slavishly imitative of Americans, we shall of course be a second rate concern. Canada at the moment is expanding rapidly and optimism abounds: we live today, as we have lived so often before, on hope. But hope deferred maketh the heart sick. Some of our great expectations must begin to be realized. Otherwise the dreary treck southward of the able, the brilliant, the highly endowed, whether ballet-dancers or engineers, professors or pugilists, for the moment decreased to smaller proportions than in the past, will be resumed. "Canada is simply a cultural hinterland of the United States" an intelligent American once exclaimed. For the great part of Canadian history the assertion unfortunately was correct. But must it forever be correct? Who wants to live in a hinterland -- in the backwoods -- except a backwoodsman?

The point of all this is that in our public broadcasting services, we at last have a way of escape, a method that will enable us to roll back the flood, that will help make us masters in our own house (which at the moment we most decidedly are not). If private interests, for purely selfish reasons, would weaken the public broadcasting services, they would, as it were, "sell us down the river".

I have never heard a programme from a private station, except some of the big metropolitan stations, which has not been filmed, or I should say, records, or imitated from somewhere or other. There is nothing informative about that as far as I can see.

I cannot for one moment believe that the people and parliament of Canada would be so recreant to their trust as for the sake of dollars to sell out this national agency of existence. Every type of question in respect to broadcasting and television will presumably be discussed before this Commission: all the problems will no doubt be explored in detail. There will be those who will attempt to centre the discussion on points of detail, on whether private stations should have more or less time for advertising, on whether there should be a separate regulatory body, on the actual sum of public expenditure involved and the devices for providing it. These are all matters of great practical importance -- they are among the topics which will be most frequently brought to the attention of the Commission and which, from a practical point of view, it will have most seriously to consider.

I therefore conclude by reaffirming the sentiment that the continued existence of Canada as a significant nation depends to a much larger degree than most people assume upon the continuance of a public broadcasting and television service of the widest scope and with ample financial resources, that the country must be prepared to pay for this essential service just as it is prepared to pay for its trans-continental railways and its national tariff policy, or its armed services, and we all know how much we have to pay for our armed services, that private persons or organizations who would weaken the public service by devices primarily intended to serve their own interests are very close to being disloyal citizens and that any public body, such as the government, which fails to make clear the necessity of the public medium to the people of Canada is failing in its duty to that people, and further, that I cannot, in my most pessimistic moments, imagine the public authorities deliberately selling out the public broadcasting service, either directly or indirectly and thereby at the same time selling out the nation whose interest they have been elected to guard and protect.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are some very interesting points in this addendum; I read it last night, Mr. Lower. Suppose you just indicate what points there are that you have discussed in the addendum, and then we will have it open for questioning

in the morning.

MR. LOWER: Well, this addendum, sir, is just a collection of points that I thought would be of interest in one way or another. They are not elaborated very much.

Section 2 is one that I think was dealt with in the first brief I heard today -- the question of advertising and its costs -- so perhaps we can pass that over.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think what we might do, since I have rather sprung this on you, is adjourn now with the idea that if there are any particular points in this part you would like to emphasize, you can do so in the morning, and then we will go on with the questions.

MR. LOWER: Yes, that would be better because I would have to read it now and emphasize it at the same time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. All right, we will adjourn until 9.30 tomorrow morning.

---The hearing adjourned at 5.30 p.m. until 9.30 a.m.

# ROYAL COMMISSION

# ON

# BROADCASTING

## HEARINGS

HELD AT

OTTAWA, ONT. SEPTEMBER 18, 1956

V.36

ROYAL COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING

Ottawa, Ontario,
Tuesday,
September 18, 1956.

PRESENT:

| | |
|---|---|
| MR. ROBERT M. FOWLER | Chairman |
| MR. EDMOND TURCOTTE | Commissioner |
| MR. JAMES STEWART | Commissioner |

- - - -

| | |
|---|---|
| MR. JOHN M. COYNE<br>MR. A. J. de GRANDPRE | Counsel |

- - - -

| | |
|---|---|
| MR. PAUL PELLETIER | Secretary |

- - - -

APPEARANCES:


PROFESSOR A. R. M. LOWER (cont'd) 5953

CANADIAN ARTS COUNCIL 5999
Dr. Boyd Neil, Dean, Royal Conservatory of Music
Mr. D. J. Ongley, Q.C., Dominion Drama Festival
Mrs. H. E. Ransom, Vice-President, Canadian Ballet Fextivals Assoc.
Mr. Roland H. Charlebois, Principal, Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Montreal
Mr. John Vaillancourt, Executive member, Canadian Arts Council
Mr. John C. Parkin, President Canadian Arts Council
Mr. H. A. Voaden, Chairman of the Committee

CANADIAN COUNCIL OF AUTHORS AND ARTISTS 6038
Mr. Neil LeRoy, President
Mr. Louis Belanger, First Vice-President
Mr. Art Macdonald, Secretary

APPEARANCES (Cont'd)


DOMINION DRAMA FESTIVAL 6119
Mr. D. J. Ongley, Q.C., President
Mr. R. Macdonald, Executive Director

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION FOR ADULT EDUCATION 6137
Dr. J. Roby Kidd, Director
Dr. O. E. Ault, Chairman
Mrs. Isabel Wilson, National Secretary
Mr. Gordon Hawkins, Assistant Director

OTTAWA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES 6166
Rev. Lorn Lemoine
Rev. W. A. Beecroft
Rev. W. H. Bradley


- - - - -

---On resuming at 9.45 a.m.

- - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Lower, you had reached the end of your brief and you were going to deal with the addendum this morning.

MR. LOWER: First of all I must ask your pardon, sir, for being late. I am staying away out at the other side of the city.

THE CHAIRMAN: Don't hurry; we have not been here very long.

MR. LOWER: Well, sir, I find it difficult to summarize this addendum because they are already synopsized.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, why don't you read them?

MR. LOWER: These are points which do not have any particular logical sequence but are things which occurred to me that I jotted down while on the way.

First, on the pressure of American programmes.

1. Pressure on the CBC for Amefican programmes is said to come prominently from the big corporations, in the belief that these get the big audiences. The counter-assertion is that while American programmes get big audiences, Canadian programmes get them too -- notably the Saturday night hockey broadcasts. I don't make very much of this point, but I just put it in more or less

for the sake of making it complete. It is understood that popular American programmes could be offset by Canadian if CBC had the funds available to work out such programmes.

2. It is to be noted that whether we produce our television programmes by taking the money directly out of annual revenue or by attempting to secure it through selling advertising, the resultant burden on the economy is the same.

That point is the same as brought out yesterday so I don't think I need to go any further on that.

Even if advertising be not considered a net charge on the national economy, it is only in such a country as the United States that advertising could possibly carry the costs of television production. Were television in Canada to become wholly or in major part a private matter, no private Canadian stations could begin to make it pay profits and keep alive. Bankrupt or about-to-be-bankrupt private stations would naturally turn for salvation to the import of "canned" films from the United States.

What Canadian firm, to take one instance, could ever indulge in the "$64,000 dollar question" programme which a certain American firm apparently finds profitable and charges up to advertising? I think it is quite hopeless for us to think in terms of such figures in Canada. This sum of money is a charge against the total American economy, just as direct as if taken out of the national treasury. But in that huge economy

it is a mere trifle.

What private television station in Canada could ever be imagined as producing anything on the scale of the recent American showing of Noel Coward's Blithe Spirit, which is said to have cost just under $150,000 for the single performance? Yet there is hope of our pooled resources, as gathered together in the national system, producing, if not shows of this lavishness, at least programmes which earn international commendation. Of course, in that sentence you have the effect of my entire brief, because, as I see it, the whole history has been our attempt to pool our resources with the State behind it in order to maintain some kind of competition with this enormous giant to the south who does this just with the turn of the hand.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just a small point: in that underlined part which you did not read:

> "There is no such thing as self-sustaining television, in the same sense as there is self-sustaining production of, say, motor cars: television programmes are comparable not to industrial production but to educational or religious undertakings, which can never be put on a commercial basis."

You say there is no such thing as self-sustained television in the same sense as is self-sustained production of motor cars. We don't know much about it yet, but we will hear more this week in

the pay-as-you-see or subscription type of television. I take it you are not referring to that?

MR. LOWER: That will be interesting if you get the audience to pay for it.

THE CHAIRMAN: We don't know very much about it.

MR. LOWER: I ran into a very remarkable instance of self-reliance when I was in Europe last year, in Holland, where practically every large existing group in the country operates its own radio system. In the Dutch town we were all gathered in -- I have forgotten the name of it -- the Calvinists have a radio station, for example. Everybody who wants to get together to operate a station does so. It is a nice tribute to Dutch independence, of which we have so frequently heard, the reliance on themselves, and I suppose that enters into this picture in a certain sense at this point.

The CBC radio programmes have been earning this commendation for years past: they are well and favourably known throughout the United States. It will be many a day before anything similar could be said of any private station in Canada.

Since private television stations in Canada are unable to produce original programmes of consequence, if they are to produce live programmes they virtually have no alternative but to lean on the CBC. This many of them do. It would be interesting to know how many of them

could carry on without the programmes provided for them at the public expense. For private stations CBC television represents an enormous annual subsidy. Perhaps this public assistance should be withdrawn from private individuals and their stations left to furnish their own programmes.

4. If networks, either television or radio, were to be permitted, they could only be built up in thickly populated areas. Transcontinental private networks are unthinkable on account of the cost. That point, I think, should be stressed. What private interests probably aspire to, is a series of networks in the most thickly populated areas, where they could skim the cream off the advertising.

5. It is to be noted that now that radio, thanks to the rise of television, is becoming somewhat free of the pressure of the mass audience, the day is at hand when it can provide more programmes of good calibre. In this connection, the desires of substantial minorities are entitled to quite as much recognition as are the desires of the mass. Democracy is not to be equated to the dominance of the mass. Democracy as a form of government must find opportunity to attach the best brains, the best tastes, to it or eventually the masses will find themselves left in the lurch by the minority, left to shift for themselves: at that point the demagogue, who can always lead silly

sheep to the slaughter, can be counted upon to make his appearance. Democracy to be a success must find and cherish its leaders. It seems to me there has been almost too much, too easy a distinction, that democracy is simply the general desire of the masses to rule, but democracy is not the rule of the masses: the masses cannot rule, but they can easily suffer the fate of the Gadarene swine. Apply this to our present situation, and it becomes obvious that programmes which attach the interest of intelligent citizens must be provided, as well as those which appeal to the great masses of mankind.

6. It is strongly to be suspected that people will listen to or look at that which is put before them. At present Canadians are conditioned to the banalities of American popular culture -- comics, movies, radio, television. The result is about as low a level of popular taste as history has ever recorded. (This, it may be interjected, is apparently to be our equipment for fighting Communism! A degraded popular taste, fed largely with thinly disguised pornography to fight Communism! If the public agency can be strongly supported it is at least permissible to hope that over a long period of years, it will be able to shape Canadian taste along lines more or less consistent with our traditions and our requirements. Again it must be emphasized that no one would be so foolish as to think in terms of some kind

of Chinese wall about the country: Canadian culture, both popular and in the higher ranges, must necessarily be eclectic.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that question of minorities, I don't want to get into any difficulties because the same word does not always mean the same thing, but we think, for example, of a minority party, where a person is a member of a minority party and remains a member of a minority party for all time. Somewhere we did have the submission made to us that where you are talking about minorities in radio and television it is a slightly different thing, and it is put to us, I think, by this witness, that every member of a majority is also a member of several minorities. In other words, a man will be a member of a hockey fan club which is an absolute majority of interest, but also may be a stamp collector. As such you have also to appeal to his majority interest as well to his minority interest.

MR. LOWER: I agree with that. Minorities should fluctuate unless you think in terms of racial and religious minorities, but we are not thinking in those terms here.

THE CHAIRMAN: I didn't think you were. In other words, you don't regard the minority appeal that you think radio and television should have as being a fixed thing?

MR. LOWER: Oh, no; I think it is decidedly flexible, but I suppose you can always

identify some kind of minority group by this programme and if it is a respectable group I don't see why it should not be allowed for some times.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just one other question. Another point you have is that having regard to the nature of the broadcasting system a minority has to be fairly large in order to be responded to by the broadcasting system?

MR. LOWER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, there is no absolute right of a minority, however, small, to be given something from the broadcasting system?

MR. LOWER: No, but I would think in this connection here of a very definite minority, you get yourself into a very uncomfortable position if you try to describe it, but I think most people in this room know what I mean -- a minority of the best people -- a very distinct minority which has its taste and criteria and in some points their tastes are identical with everybody else and in some points differ sharply. I think you cannot differentiate in the same way; it is there, and that is what I had in mind. They are a defending minority.

Now, as to the popular appeal, Point 6 deals with that, and I cannot overstress that. I feel very strongly. If we just follow our instincts and follow mass production that is where we get to. We get no defence at all. We get no defence against a creed which

is very conscious of this and which has a very clear-cut doctrine and which instils its doctrine into its adherents and knows where it stands. If we follow that our culture will be disintegrated by this strong force.

You get the occasional example of that. I have heard children whistling in the street the odd bar of a very well known piece of good music, for example, which I don't think would have ever occurred prior to the radio regime. You can find these little straws in the wind to indicate radio is having its effect in raising popular taste. On that level one doesn't care whether it is Canadian particularly; it is universal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lower, you then agree that American programmes have this effect?

MR. LOWER: The function of Madison Avenue is to establish our taste. It is not too bad if we can be switched by Madison Avenue from one toothpaste to another, but when this direction is towards spiritual forces of life we are in peril. We can have some interesting discussions about that. What makes Americans so unpopular in Europe is the so-called Coca-Colaization. This degradation of culture is something which an older civilization finds very hard to accept.

Television, it is declared, has become the biggest single form of recreation in the country. Canadians are no longer a rugged

outdoors people; they are leaving the more strenuous sports to those peoples more able to play them and retreating to the passive delights of the television viewers' chairs. If our young people needs must view television rather than play hockey, then it becomes imperative that they at least have reasonably good programmes to look at. By using the power of the state we must do everything possible to ward off the degeneracy that modern progress entails. If television is no good for our bodies, it may be possible to make it of a certain amount of use for our minds.

That this can be done is attested by the record of some of the programmes actually produced: CBC National News is supposed to be the most popular programme given in the city of Toronto, getting two-thirds of the potential audience at the hour at which given. Fighting Words is one of the most popular of all television programmes. There is no doubt about the ability of the public radio to give the public what it wants, if it can only be maintained in a financial position to do so. Some of these programmes radiate out to immense distances. Take for example, Farm Forum, which is reported to have over 900 organized listening groups.

I often listen to Farm Forum myself, not that I am interested in rural matters, but because it is a good talk and I don't think

there is anything that goes so well with other people as good talks. People like to hear other people talk.

THE CHAIRMAN: We can subscribe to that.

MR. LOWER: One of the objections to allowing the private stations more scope lies simply in the record. There are the violations of the public regulations, designed to get in more advertising: these violations can be confirmed by any one who sits down and listens to a local station with a stop watch in his hand.

One of my colleagues has done just that and is going to present some of his findings to you in a day or two.

On one local station, for example, a "plug" of advertising is inserted between the regular CBC programmes in the evening -- so that the beginnings of certain programmes are truncated by the voice of the local advertiser. There is the type of thing which occurred recently in Moncton, New Brunswick, where a station owner used the air to make propaganda against the public system and refused a responsible local citizen, acting in a representative capacity, equal opportunity over his station, to reply.

The next remark is something that attached to myself. There were the malevolent remarks on the part of the then president of an association of private broadcasters directed against a group of prominent citizens in Halifax

during the winter of 1955,on the occasion of their taking a public stand on behalf of public broadcasting.

In this connection it is to be noted that no one who defends the public radio has any "axe to grind", whereas those who seek to weaken it in favour of private interests are pursuing their own selfish monetary interests.

I do not feel this question of the separate Commission of control is one for me because I do not know the details. The following points may be noted in brief:

A. The CBC has been supine in the matter of enforcing its own regulations. These are violated day after day, especially in respect to the ratio of advertising supposed to be permitted. It is suggested that the CBC be much more rigorous in enforcing the law. The CBC is to be criticized not for being too severe with private stations but too lenient with them.

B. There are not two systems of broadcasting in Canada, only one, the public system.

C. A separate commission of control would in most respects be a fifth wheel to the coach. It would simply duplicate functions already being performed, and would rob the present system of its desirable flexibility.

D. What would such a commission do beyond what the present arrangement secures? Almost certainly the fact that it is urged so vigorously means that hope is entertained of using it to injure the public system. There are a dozen different lines of manipulative approach which might be used.

I will omit my point 11. On point 12 I say the public system in Canada has retained remarkable degree of freedom of expression. Private stations, through timidity, cannot be expected to maintain a great deal of freedom of speech: they will play safe.

That is an important point, because on the surface it looks as if an agency which has a semi-monopoly and which has an aspect of government could be very dangerous to our freedom of speech and under certain circumstances undoubtedly it could. As somebody said yesterday, that depends entirely on the last resort on the soundness of public opinion but when we view the thing out in public, at any rate we can watch it and we can ventilate our grievances through parliament and many other ways. If the broadcasting were entirely in private hands it would be exceedingly difficult to get at this question of freedom of speech over the air because one would never know what had been allowed and what had not been allowed and it would really go down to the discretion of people who operate the stations.

This I think is very important; the CBC, it is suggested, might go still further in this direction, for arranging a certain amount of time each week free to anyone who wanted to air his views, "get it off his chest". This is done in the newspapers, any reasonable letter will get space in the daily newspaper and I would like to see a great many more of them because we do not talk enough like

that in Canada. If we apply the same system to the air it should be interesting and bring results, some free-for-all for citizens over the air and some time every week allotted for that type of thing.

The time has come when national unity could be strengthened by a cautious introduction into the networks of programmes in the French language, produced in French Canada. Many people comment on the superior artistic skill displayed in the French networks' programmes and on the generally higher type of subject matter which they carry over the radio. Both these aspects of high standards may be explained, possibly by interpreting Quebec as a province where the old world culture has not yet been as completely swamped by North Americanism as in English Canada.

However that may be, there are considerable numbers of English-speaking Canadians who would enjoy listening to certain good programmes and at the same time appreciate the opportunity to "polish up their French". It is a fact not generally known that our census returns indicate that quite large groups in all of our cities -- especially in our university cities -- put themselves down as speaking both English and French. These groups are much larger than any classification based on racial origin will account for. The conclusion is clear -- that considerable numbers of English Canadians, having enjoyed the benefits of the training in the French language which they have received, whether in high school or university, are glad to be able to claim this extra skill; they may

therefore be presumed to be glad of an opportunity to keep it fresh.

Public opinion in general in English Canada, is probably not yet ready for any widespread introduction of French programmes, large sections of English Canada being far too narrow minded for that. But should not the modest desires of a considerable minority of intelligent people receive some recognition?

14. In conclusion, my suggestions are:

A. that the present arrangements be continued without material change, but

B. that the finances of the CBC be put on a secure and permanent footing by direct parliamentary appropriation, in the same way and, for the same national purpose as appropriations are made for the armed services,

C. that no separate regulatory body be set up, the necessity for it not being apparent,

D. that the CBC enforce its regulations, refusing to its subordinate officers the privilege of waiving them at discretion, and

E. that no further cases be permitted in the operation, directly or indirectly, of broadcasting and television stations by newspapers.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Dr. Lower, we are grateful to you for the obvious amount of interest and

time you have devoted to the subject and for your willingness to come here as a private citizen and give us the benefit of your historical experience, knowledge and views. Mr. Coyne?

MR. COYNE: Dr. Lower, I would like to just ask you a few fairly general questions arising out of various points you have made. The first point arises on page 5 where you are speaking of the modern technical devices of communication and the Canadian pattern.

MR. LOWER: Yes.

MR. COYNE: And you refer to air transportation in this way:

> "When the airways were developed, it was decided that there should be a system of national trans-continental air communication: Trans-Canada Air Lines is the result. The existence of Trans-Canada Air Lines does not prevent the existence of private airways. Air transportation gives us one more illustration of the Canadian pattern: a public system maintained with the express intention of binding the country together, and various private systems existing primarily for the benefit of their operators, but also serving more or less useful local purpose."

In some of the representations which we have received from private broadcasters, or private interests

concerned with broadcasting they would say that this is precisely how they would describe the development of radio and television communication in Canada and in fact if you substituted the CBC for Trans-Canada Air Lines in your sentences here we would say that is the history of radio and television in Canada. Then they go one step further and they say these are direct analogies, the phrases and the [illegible] system or the other but in the case of air lines there is a board called the Air Transport Board which maintains a general supervision and control over both segments, private and public, of the industry. They say since these situations are so similar we recommend that there should be the [illegible] board for broadcast. Now, [illegible] representations I am describing, do not suggest [illegible] the public system should be [illegible] or weakened, they do not suggest [illegible] system is not the most important, nation[illegible] in this system but they say nonetheless and drawing an analogy from the air lines there should be a consistent type of structure. You do not agree with that and I know that you say that this question of the separate board is not something which you [illegible] comment on that argument as an argument?

MR. LOWER: Well, sir, the point that occurs to me is that while there is an analogy there, there is no question about it, at the same time in each of these

cases we have decided this question of jurisdiction in and for that case without much attention to analogies. The type of supervision has grown out of the nature of the case, not out of any general rule that we have set up for the conduct of these two-sided systems of ours. In the case of the air there is, I believe, a separate jurisdiction in that case and the railways, there is a separate jurisdiction but that, as I mentioned, grew up before there was any public system at all. I think of the case of the banks which are supervised in a different way again. It would seem to me that analogy does not help you very much about that to make a decision on the necessities of the case, that is, that you have to confine the consideration of supervision and broadcasting to broadcasting.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could I put the question in a slightly different form? We have had many different statements about the separate regulatory board for radio and there appears to be a good deal of feeling and thought about it, possibly part of it induced by those who have argued it vigorously for many years and those who are against it say as you do that such an extra board is unnecessary. That is, as you put it, a fifth wheel on the cart. However, I gather from your remarks that you feel there was something more in it than this. The question is, what harm do you anticipate would be caused by having an independent regulatory board? What harm would come to the existing national system? You just

barely touched on it in one part of your brief, would you expand on it?

MR. LOWER: I think you are going to get me rapidly out of my depth in that I do not profess to have any knowledge of the technicalities and my opinion is probably not worth very much. I would imagine that the harm it might do would be to snarl the whole thing up in legal proceedings. That would be the most obvious thing. I am told by broadcasting people that apparently there is a great deal of need for quick decision and a good deal of flexibility in the conduct of the broadcasting between the two systems and if you are going to have other things, you have to meet some kind of legal argument then you just get bogged down. That seems to be the practical argument against an objective body of control.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Lower, you as a historian have observed governmental institutions and work for some years. The way it has been put to us, as I understand it, we now have a Board of Governors, call it what you like, which is appointed to represent the public interest, a representation of the general points of view in geographical areas throughout Canada. As far as it has been spelled out, the separate regulatory board would be similarly constituted. I think we put the question to a number of proponents of the idea and they say that the separate regulatory board would obviously have to take account of the position of the CBC, the public station in order to reach its decisions. Now, supposing you

had these two boards similarly constituted, the same kind of personnel in existence tomorrow, what in your experience -- let me explain what my question is, do you in fact achieve in this kind of system a real change. Do the two boards ever draw together in which you have the same decision made twice, by a certain closeness of integration of the two or do they spring apart and one or the other dominate in which case you are back where you started?

MR. LOWER:

To begin with, I would like to know the clauses in the Broadcasting Act which govern the regulatory board of the CBC. I don't know what those clauses are or what is the extent of its powers in detail. I don't know how they exercise them, and I would think that any independent body set up would depend on a very careful drafting of regulations for control. There are certain large questions I can see but I would say we could go about it in the same way as the Board of Railway Commissioners or one of those other boards, but if it were to undertake day to day regulations of the relations between the two systems I would think that we will be back where we started surely.

Now, as a friend of the public broadcasting system -- not necessarily this present CBC's body -- I make the distinction there, but as a friend of the principle of public broadcasting, I would also be afraid that if you had a separate regulatory body you would have private broadcasters hiring -- saving your presence -- high-powered lawyers and dragging the thing through the court and in general turning the law against the public system. The public system would find it difficult to compete in those respects and I would imagine would always be against it. Now I believe it has been suggested that the public system as emanating from the Crown is not really free to urge its case in public. That would be accentuating it. It would seem to me if you have an independent impartial judicial body before which the two of them both come on equal terms that would

be accentuating this difficulty. If, on the other hand, you had a body which is regulatory in detail, it would surely be right back where you are now, and it may be, I don't know, if the CBC has a separate section for regulatory functions or whether they keep the two of them distinct or not, I don't know what their organization is, but, surely the thing should turn on the justice of what is done. Are there any cases of injustice -- I have watched the papers but I have seen no reports of specific cases of tyranny on behalf of the CBC but; from my own personal experience, I have seen many cases of laxity as I have pointed out here. It seems to me that possibly an independent body would at least have the worry of getting the law enforced which the present regulatory body does not do.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The proponents of the separate regulatory body, or some of them rather, have brought forth the point of view here that if there is no right of appeal from the decisions of the CBC, as it is presently constituted, that certain injustices might occur. I think as a matter of fact we have had three specific instances where they feel they have been discriminated against and they have had no right of appeal, and that seems to be the burden of your case.

MR. LOWER: Well I don't want to get into that subject sir but it would go against my sense of justice to prevent anybody from having a right of appeal, if they felt that they had had an injustice done to them.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

MR. LOWER: Surely we would have to recommend some kind of review of the cases.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the difficulty there, as we have discussed with one witness last week in Montreal, is not on the principle of the value of the right of appeal, but the practical problem as to how this appeal can be created.

MR. LOWER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: The appeal to the courts -- I think most people would agree that that would be unworkable.

MR. LOWER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You could not expect the magistrates or the justices to have the background knowledge necessary to give an informed opinion on the manner of broadcasting policy and so on -- it is not just as easy as it sounds to create the right of appeal.

MR. LOWER: Well I know, but there are a good many examples which could be reviewed. There is an elaborate right of appeal in respect to the income tax for example. And in the first instance you appeal from one set of tax gatherers to another and they rule on your case I believe, and if you don't like that decision you can carry the thing further. I suppose eventually you could wind up in the courts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well that is precisely my point, Mr. Lower. The fact that when you are dealing

with a subject like income tax there are really no policies involved.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: It is a question of law.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is a question of whether the tax is leviable or is it not.

MR. LOWER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And that is the appropriate and easy kind of thing which you can send to the court.

MR. LOWER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if it is a question of whether or not there should be a new station in Val d'Or now -- and who should get it --

MR. LOWER: Well for the life of me I do not know how these decisions are made. I see them referred to in the press from time to time and the CBC seems to be acting in those cases and making decisions as between two private individuals -- the public interest does not come into it at all in that case surely. The regulatory body is quite apart from the question of the public interest.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well actually it is not a very good illustration because the granting of licenses has got a kind of appeal involved in it, in that the Minister of Transport issues the licenses and the CBC is asked to and does hold a public hearing to hear the various points of view and to make recommendations. The decision is made by the Governor in Council.

MR. LOWER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: There has been the odd case where the CBC's recommendation was not followed and

some other person than the one they took as first choice has actually received the license so, in that sense there is a sort of appeal.

MR. LOWER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: But let us take another kind of thing -- let us take a decision as to the amount of imported programmes, let us say, that come to Canada. Some regulations have to do with the amount of imported programmes which is a matter of concern obviously, to a great many people. Well now that kind of decision will be very difficult to send to a court.

MR. LOWER: Well of course and I think it would be difficult for a kind of authority to lay down policy in that respect. That is in a general way a kind of emanation of public opinion. I don't know just how that sort of thing does get decided. I suppose it was decided in one case in an arbitrary way where private stations have to carry CBC programmes, I believe from 8 to 11 o'clock at night. They do sometimes make an arbitrary decision like that. However I don't see an over-riding body would be in any way better off to meet that kind of decision than is the present body. It is the court of last resort surely there. The first consideration is the public interest -- but not a body, not an independent body.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well if you don't like it you always like another place to go to but there must come an end to it, of course.

MR. LOWER: Well let's take it to parliament

and let us have it debated out. These are matters of broad public policy. The question is are we going to allow our air to be used by imported programmes in this case or, can we produce the programmes ourselves. In the last resort we can only decide on the basis of the general feeling of the Canadian public and we have to provide a proper means of expression for that and parliament is the obvious place, surely, but not from boards sitting in some rooms somewhere or other.

MR. COYNE: Dr. Lower, turn to page 10 where you are discussing the constitutional angle, freedom of discussion, about the middle of the page you say there is no doubt but that we shall have to go on into an indefinite future building the country by the same device -- the spoken word. No longer can we afford to have the media for transmitting the spoken word entirely in private hands than we could afford to have our defence forces in private hands. Now the general proposition that has been put to us is the great similarity between the medium of broadcasting or the spread of the spoken word, if you like, and the medium of the printing press or the spread of the written word. I think you would probably, and this may be a paradox, if you were speaking of the written word, would have put that sentence in almost directly the opposite sense. What is the distinction which should be made, as a matter of public policy, between the amount of private initiative permitted in the spoken word

or broadcasting and the amount of initiative permitted in the printed word.

MR. LOWER: Well here is another analogy and you can make a dozen analogies between the world of journalism and the world of broadcasting. There is another type of analogy you can make too and I think should be introduced at that point, and that is the analogy between broadcasting and our educational institutions. Now education is not in the normal way in private hands. Education is a public function. It is not a monopoly of one institution. It is true that anybody could start a university if they wish to but not many people do. However we are at least keeping three things in mind. There is a balance between them and each one has its own special characteristics. There is no exact parallel and it seems to me that you have got to be completely material in this matter -- not theoretical at all. What will preserve the freedom of the spoken word best? This is your simple answer, because it goes one way in journalism and another way in education, that does not necessarily mean that either one of those ways should be accepted in broadcasting, and, I think you might find a solution is that the public radio is a fairly good guarantee of the freedom of the spoken word. It is not perfect by any manner of means, but it is a fairly good guarantee.

MR. COYNE: And in your view a better guarantee than would be available through the purely private initiative in this field. Is that correct?

MR. LOWER: Oh certainly yes. I suppose the mixture of the two is not a bad thing -- competition is the life of trade. I can easily see that there could be situations in which public radio could become a very great menace and it has come to be so, of course, in certain of the European countries. I do not foresee that in Canada but in any event private radio is fairly useful in offsetting that possibility.

MR. COYNE: More or less on this line, but on a slightly different aspect of it, a great deal has been made in various representations before this Commission about the fact that the CBC is responsible directly to Parliament rather than to the Government or to a specific minister of the Government. Do you place enough significance on that type of decision?

MR. LOWER: No, sir, I am afraid I don't. I don't know what "responsible directly to Parliament" would mean. After all, the CBC has got to have public funds, and who is going to recommend the appropriation of those funds except a minister of the Crown? Nobody can, constitutionally, do so. CBC must report through some individual: what individual? If not a minister of the Crown, I don't know. I suppose they could report to the Speaker. I suppose somebody has to be responsible in Parliament for the presentation of the report, and in practice, of course, Parliament, unfortunately, is meeting less and less and the Cabinet meeting more and more in our system.

MR. COYNE: In those circumstances how does one attempt to buttress this public control of broadcasting against the sort of thing you were speaking of earlier of domination by the Government rather than a party-- that is, a domination by some specific political point of view which seeks to use the system?

MR. LOWER: There is no patent method. We can never put into words some safety device

for these things. Everything depends on the health of our public opinion. That, in practice, I suppose, means that it depends to a very considerable degree on the personality of the indivduals who are responsible for the public broadcast system -- what they can do. It depends on the good sense of Parliament; it depends on an effective opposition, and so on; it depends on there being members of Parliament, even among the back benchers on the Government side, who will take an intelligent interest in these things and see the situation at long-range. It is the intangible factors that are important.

MR. COYNE: Dealing with a rather specific point, and I am raising it because I don't think it has been put forward, I don't think there is anything in the Broadcasting Act which says anything about reporting directly to Parliament. I am not sure on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think there is, Mr. Coyne.

MR. COYNE: The governors are appointed for fixed terms, but they are removable for cause at any time by the Governor in Council. I don't know what "cause" means; I suppose it is any cause the Government determines. Do you think there would be any merit in making it more difficult for the Governor in Council to remove the governors?

MR. LOWER: What is the length of their term; can you tell me that?

THE CHAIRMAN: Three years.

MR. COYNE: Three years, except for the chairman who is appointed for ten years and occupies a permanent position for that time.

MR. LOWER: Well, I would think a board constituted in that way would be strengthened. That is just an offhand opinion. Maybe a longer term and more difficulties in the way of removal -- I don't know what cause is. I doubt very much if any governor has been removed. In practice I expect he is there definitely for his three years. If he were there a little while longer he would get to know more about the system, and, if it were a wise appointment to begin with, he may develop a greater independence.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is fair to say that retiring governors are eligible for reappointment, and it may be that that is the practice. Just on a somewhat similar question, the chairman is designated by the Governor in Council, and the general manager, who is the chief executive of the Corporation, is appointed by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Corporation.

MR. LOWER: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you any thoughts as to whether there would be any virtue in having the operating officials, the general manager and others, appointed directly by the Board of Governors?

MR. LOWER: Well, I think it would be

rather a good idea. What is the practice in connection with the General Manager of the Canadian National? That is a very important post in this country. Is he appointed by the Government?

THE CHAIRMAN: By the Governor in Council.

MR. COYNE: You mean the General Manager as distinct from the President of the Canadian National?

MR. LOWER: Oh, yes, I am sorry. I was thinking of the President.

MR. COYNE: He is appointed by Order in Council.

MR. LOWER: Yes. I would think there is certain virtue in having an important official like this one removed from Government control. There is no doubt that here, too, we are trying for something; we are in an experimental stage and it is interesting to the observer to see how the Canadian people are seeking about to set up institutions which will at the same time be public institutions and yet not under the control of the mere political whim of the day.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps more precisely we are looking for devices which will allow public money to be devoted to national purposes without political interference?

MR. LOWER: Yes, in a rather invidious sense.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Coyne, the section is No. 23 of the Act which says that the Corporation shall, through the minister, submit an annual

report to Parliament.

MR. COYNE: Yes, my colleague drew my attention to that, and I think that is the only section in which this reference is made. Dr. Lower, just one other question, and it arises out of Point No. 12 in your addendum: you say:

> "The public system in Canada has retained a remarkable degree of freedom of expression. Private stations, through timidity, cannot be expected to maintain a great deal of freedom of speech: they will play safe."

We have had almost precisely the opposite view put to us, that the trouble with the CBC, facing as it does such pressures to maintain an absolute propriety and not indicate bias, that inevitably the CBC is, in fact, forced to ensure a rather neutral view over its airways, and that this is inevitable in this type of public operation.

MR. LOWER: I think that is complete nonsense. I have done a good deal of broadcasting myself, and I have never, right through the war, had the slightest interference. I have been completely at liberty to say what I liked, both in formal talks and in these conversational run-arounds that we have -- Citizens Forum and all that sort of thing. There has never been the slightest suggestion ---

MR. COYNE: I don't think it was suggested there was interference in the sense in which you speak, but that the inevitable overall

result was to endeavour to shy away from the most controversial topics.

MR. LOWER: I don't think so.

THE CHAIRMAN: If I may interpose here: this question really answers itself, because anyone who would suggest Dr. Lower would shy away from anything . . . (laughter).

MR. COYNE: Well, perhaps you don't agree with that situation.

MR. LOWER: Not for a moment. Take the Citizens Forum: each year I get a sheet from the Adult Education Association, I think it is who send it out, asking for suggestions and topics, and those sheets, I suppose, go out to a great variety of people, and from suggestions received, the programme is made up. It is the widest kind of programme and it gives a very fine representation, it would seem to me, of the issues which are of interest at the time. I would doubt very much indeed whether that programme conscientiously would shy away from any issue. Of course, occasionally you get outcries. There was a series on Oldfield's Astronomy some time ago that created quite a to-do. I don't know what the situation was there, I am sure, but if it were that the CBC people stopped the series -- and I don't think it went that far -- well, then, that was reprehensible and they should not have done it. They should have brazened the outcry; but wouldn't a series of private stations have done just the same thing?

I know there was a case of that sort which attacked an Association of which I was a member during the war, in which the private stations would not allow this Association to go on with its series of broadcasts because it was afraid of what was being said. So I don't think you can make out a case against the public radio there.

THE CHAIRMAN: If an odd programme creates a bit of public to-do, as you call it, that is not a bad thing, is it?

MR. LOWER: I think it is excellent. Plenty of people object, but I think it is excellent. May I give you a little illustration of that which just occurred to me: Mr. Coyne may remember this; it was in Winnipeg where we had two gentlemen, both very worthy citizens: one was a professor of Botany in the university and the other was the representative of the Catholic Diocese of Winnipeg and a good friend of mine, and a long and bitter controversy occurred over some practical question -- birth control, or something of that sort -- which ran through the papers for several weeks between these two gentlemen, and they both produced a great deal of light and learning on the subject. There wasn't any heat, really; they conducted it in a gentlemanly way, and it seems to me it was excellent in that here was a very fine medium of public education. Well, apply that to a radio, and I don't see, and myself don't fear, any kind of discussion over the air -- the more

the better.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Dr. Lower, when we were in Vancouver, where there is only one television station operated by CBC, we heard very general complaints that the nature of the programmes carried on that station were such that the listening audience was small, with the result that Canadian advertisers had gone to the Bellingham station and directed their advertising to the Canadian public through that station. Airways know no boundaries, and you fear, I take it, the intrusion of these American programmes, but how can we avoid, particularly along the boundaries, receiving those, and where they are -- as apparently they are -- more popular than the Canadian versions; what are we going to do about it?

MR. LOWER: The only thing we can do is to provide something that will in time appeal. That is all we can do. The international boundary is not a barrier to the airways, of course.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: And there is an invisible Canadian import, really, through the export of that advertising.

MR. LOWER: You mean it comes into our balance of payments, and so on?

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes.

MR. LOWER: That is true, but we have to accept a good deal of that sort of thing, necessarily, because our job in this country -- and

it is a job to which I have devoted almost all my life -- is that of creating a nation, and that goes to every nook and cranny of our life -- our popular culture and our learned culture included, and it is a long, slow business.

THE CHAIRMAN: And it is also a business of creating this in our geographical situation beside the United States.

MR. LOWER: Exactly. It is almost impossible, and I defy anyone who is in the area, not to lose faith at times and wonder whether it is worth while carrying on, but we do carry on, and I suppose we will carry on, and we have got to expect that sort of thing.

-

-

-

-

COMMISSIONER STEWART: I take it from your remarks you feel, generally speaking, that programmes given on the air by CBC are of a reasonably high calibre. Now, if that is the case, then what is the matter with the Canadian public that they wish, as we have evidence that they do wish, to hear the American rather than the Canadian? I asked the question of some professors at the University of British Columbia, when we were there. Is this a case of faraway fields look green or are we suffering from an inferiority complex?

MR. LOWER: It is a very long story and it would take a very long time to discuss that question. You cannot live beside these extremely dynamic people without being very much influenced and our popular culture is, of course, American -- completely American. It doesn't have many of the redeeming features of American civilization but it has all the worst. It is very much like the traditional savage who when the missionary gets him to put on clothes puts on the top hat and boots and nothing in between. Canadians assume they know American civilization, but they do not know it. They know it from its examination, they don't know its excellencies. We are limited because we are alongside these dynamic and imaginative people. We will take their popular culture. Of course, we will. It is only when the spirit of nationalism comes

along in Canada that there will be any desire built up, but it has not gone very far today. The average English-speaking Canadian today does not know that he is a Canadian. He takes what goes. He is a kind of generalized Anglo-Saxon. The difficulty, sir, is we have never had any very great spiritual experience, we have had no revolution and no civil war, and we have been a very well behaved, unaggresive, mild kind of people who just followed the leader, and consequently we take American civilization as a matter of course along with their washing machines and everything else, and it is only very slowly indeed that we shall develop something of our own and I look on radio as one of the major media for doing that very thing.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In paragraph 3 of your addendum, page 20, you question how much programming the private television stations could give were it not for the amount spent by the CBC?

MR. LOWER: No.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: That may be correct at the moment except to say they could get films, and, possibly, if permitted, could bring in programmes given over American stations?

MR. LOWER: Oh, nothing easier.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The point I am getting at, there is something else again, because in radio there are a number of stations that must carry a certain amount of CBC programming

and it has been put to us by certain people that in doing so CBC are subsidizing the private radio stations. Mr. Dunton, when he was before us, was quite frank to say, since they were forced by the Act to give a national broadcast service they would either be required to use a certain number of private stations to give them the necessary stations or they would be required to pu up stations of their own at great public expense, so he felt there was no subsidization at all. Those programmes were carried by the private stations without payment from one side to the other, and there seems to be general agreement there is no subsidy in that. That may be the pattern that will be required to be followed when they develop -- to a greater extent than at present manifest -- a television system.

Since there seems to be general agreement on that point I wondered if you would care to enlarge to any extent your remarks in that paragraph No. 3 on page 20?

MR. LOWER: Well, sir, I think you have covered the essentials of this question very well. I don't know that I have anything of value to add. It would seem to me that all important areas in this country should have at least the privilege of listening to the different broadcasts if they want to. The national system should be available. At present it is not so. In our town it is difficult to get either Toronto or Montreal. We are halfway between and we have

to rely upon private stations.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that subsidies is the dirty word, and what it amounts to is, for private stations the CBC programmes may have value. It may also have value to the CBC in having the programmes carried by the private stations.

MR. LOWER: I think we ought to be, at least, consistent that when a private station is the outlet of CBC -- I would like to mention the Couchiching programmes, I personally would have liked to have listened to those programmes but I was not allowed to. They were not available.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: They were ignored except on this one station?

MR. LOWER: You might get another station if you are lucky.

THE CHAIRMAN: In your area when you wanted to listen to the Couchiching discussion, because the local station did not carry it and the private station did not carry it, you did not get it?

MR. LOWER: I did not get it.

THE CHAIRMAN: You deal somewhere with common ownership by newspapers and broadcasters, and we have had a number of submissions on it. I don't know whether we will have to deal with it or not, but we have had various opinions. Some opinions are, as you have expressed, that this ought to be a matter of prohibition and newspapers should not receive radio and television licences. It is felt that sometimes there is

certainly a potential danger of destroying the industry through this public medium, and it is a matter that should be watched but it should not be a matter of prohibition because it may impede the wise development of the system. In other words, there might be some advantage in having a mixed ownership. They did argue a common ownership of several stations and several media may offer a wider experience to the public; a chance to get better men into the field and offer more opportunity to them.

There is one point that came up, I think, last week, and that is -- I think it is in your memorandum -- there may be some advantages in having motivations other than profit alone for the station. If you have to choose between a completely independent operator, on the one hand, private, and one that has an existing newspaper, that might be doing this for quite a different motivation than profit, you might get a better performance just precisely because he didn't always have to have his eye on the specific profits of the organization. Have you anything more to say on this question on the monopolization of the media, the communication?

MR. LOWER: It seems to me it is something that would stand a great deal of discussion and we have to feel our way. You know the danger that monopoly is in today is much greater than it used to be. Take the great

names in journalism in this country. Mackenzie, George Brown, George W. Dafoe, Ryerson -- some of the greatest names in our history were journalistic names. All of these men found it easy to establish a newspaper. It didn't cost very much money and their newspaper was mostly a paper of opinion. Those days are over, and newspapers today are more nearly semi-monopolies -- and those particular producers were not themselves impersonal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you say impersonal?

MR. LOWER: Impersonal. I don't like to see that tendency encouraged and it is the direction towards which radio and the newspapers seem to tend. I never like making hard and fast decisions on any of these matters. My mind is essentially empirical, I think.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think my question was badly phrased. Is this a matter that should be dealt with by prohibition or is it something that should be watched and considered and dealt with on the specific case?

MR. LOWER: I would like to see it processed down a bit. We have a good many examples in associations of newspapers and radio stations, and some newspapers in this situation are owned by men who own a good many papers, a string of them, so you have quite a large organization built up in that way. Well, how about slowing that process down

in future without making too hard and fast a rule? Let us not be doctrinaires at all. I don't like it very much, I don't like to see this monopolization of opinion. It may have these advantages you suggest, but how about slowing it down and in future not have very much more of it until we see how it works out?

THE CHAIRMAN: Then, I just have one other question. We have to try to look as far ahead as we can in making recommendations, and you have given us a very valuable historical picture of the process of Canadianism that has developed over the past and as it exists today, and in particular mentioning this problem we have of resisting American cultural influence. What do you think the future holds in this regard as we will look forward to development of atomic energy for peaceful uses? As we look forward to more automation, is this problem going to get tougher or is it going to get easier?

MR. LOWER: It is going to get tougher, sir, and it is going to get a lot tougher. It is a problem all small peoples feel. It is the problem that explains Colonel Nasser and the people in Cyprus -- the desperate efforts of small people to maintain their identity and with every facility of increased communication the struggle becomes harder and harder. We feel the efforts of the people in Quebec to maintain their automony, with everything pressing in against them. It is going to be a harder and harder struggle; I cannot imagine

what the future will be. I hate to say history teaches, because that is something that an historian should never say, but leave that to the layman who doesn't know what history teaches.

There is one thing under this constant centralization; it means the decay and enfeeblement of the secondary centres and that is going to apply to us. There is no question about that. This will be a very big country and a country that does not offer very much if it centres everywhere else but in itself. So there you have to leave it. It is a constant struggle between two forces -- a local force that wants to maintain its identity and a natural tendency for things to keep moving towards any given centre.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Lower, thank you very much. I express to you again our appreciation for the public spirit you have shown in this matter in preparing this long brief and coming here before us.

---Short recess.

-

-

-

SUBMISSION OF
CANADIAN ARTS COUNCIL

Appearances:

Dr. Boyd Neil, Dean, Royal Conservatory of Music

Mr. D. J. Ongley, Q.C., Dominion Drama Festival

Mrs. H. E. Ransom, Vice-President, Canadian Ballet Festivals Association

Mr. Roland H. Charlebois, Principal, Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Montreal

Mr. John Vaillancourt, Executive member, Canadian Arts Council

Mr. John C. Parkin, President Canadian Arts Council

Mr. H. A. Voaden, Chairman of the Committee

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief we are going to receive is that of the Canadian Arts Council, which will be marked as Exhibit No. 209.

EXHIBIT NO. 209: Brief of the Canadian Arts Council

THE CHAIRMAN: I understand Mr. Parkin will be presenting the brief, and would you introduce those who are with you, Mr. Parkin?

MR. PARKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On my left is Mrs. H. E. Ransom, who is the honorary treasurer of the Canadian Arts Council and the newly elected president of the Canadian Ballet Festivals Association. On my right is Mr. H. A Voaden, a past president of the Canadian Arts Council, and the chairman of our committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we begin I would like to mention two telegrams we have received and which I will read into the record. The first one reads:

> "Composers authors publishers association indirectly members Canadian Arts Council through Canadian music council. When advised arts council proposed filing brief along certain lines we opposed and requested our name withdrawn. Deeply regret our request ignored. We haven't seen brief but objected to certain unwarranted proposals contained in letter of proposal circulated by Arts Council.
>
> W. Low,
> General Manager, CAPAC"

The second one reads as follows:

> "Have been advised that an organization called the Canadian Arts Council has submitted a brief to Royal Commission on Broadcasting. Are further informed this brief lists BMI Canada Limited, 16 Gould Street Toronto as one of its members. Wish officially to advise you we know nothing whatever of this brief that we have never seen it nor been consulted with respect to it that we wish to be on record as not endorsing any part of this document please file this telegram as part of your records.
>
> BMI Canada Limited, Robert J. Burton, General Manager."

You may not wish to deal with these throughout your

presentation, but they must be recorded in connection with this presentation.

MR. PARKIN: Mr. Fowler and members of the Royal Commission, the leading members of our delegation are not all present, but we do have the president of two our component societies with us, Mr. D. J. Ongley, who will be appearing before the Commission later, and Mr. Neil LeRoy, another society of the Canadian Arts Council. CAC is composed of twenty national organizations largely in the professional field of the arts and culture. I may say we are extremely honoured to have the association of the CAPAC and BMI, but they are not members of the Canadian Arts Council. They are both members of the Canadian Music Council which was a founder member of the Canadian Arts Council some twelve years ago, under the chairmanship of the vice-president, Sir Ernest Macmillan. We have on behalf of the Music Council an endorsation to our brief, on behalf of that body, and we had deemed that sufficient, and all that was necessary, to add strength to our own particular brief. This is a purely internal matter of the Canadian Music Council itself. We cleared with BMI and CAPAC as to the endorsation of our particular brief. They are not members. I may say this too very strongly, they are not members of the Canadian Arts Council and there is no means of securing indirect affiliation with the Canadian Arts Council. We represent twenty national societies, such as my own Institute and

the Architects Association and Authors Association, and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN: What you are really saying is that these telegrams went to the wrong place?

MR. PARKIN: They went to the wrong place. They should have gone, perhaps, to Sir Ernest Macmillan's office. In addition to that we have been somewhat concerned during the last three or four days by a series of telegrams which have gone out, I would guess, to the majority, and I am speaking on circumstantial evidence here, but the majority of the members of the Canadian Arts Council over the signature of the General Manager of CARTB. It is a rather loaded question in the nature of "Have you stopped beating your wife?" In other words, "Is it true that you do not endorse the brief of the Canadian Arts Council? Wire collect this afternoon." We regret very much that these telegrams were sent out to my own institute, and the national organizations which are represented on the Council, and we feel they should first have come to us. The endorsations are all in hand and that of my own Institute is now in hand.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you happen to have a copy of the CARTB telegram?

MR. PARKIN: I believe we have a copy here today, yes, which we will file with you.

We have prepared a synopsis of our own particular brief which may be of interest, inasmuch

as various groups represented in the Council are among those which will be called upon in some very large measure to fulfil what Dr. Lower has alluded to earlier today -- the necessity of building the new Canadian nation.

Three national ballet organizations and the component societies of sculpture and various other organizations including the Canadian Music Council and others, the Canadian Council of Authors and Artists, the Opera Festival Association and the Dominion Drama Association are represented. We believe that the basic function of the present system was made clear in 1867. The CBC television must play the same role as radio has played in this past quarter century, reinforcing our sense of national identity and contributing to our development of arts and letters. This flow will prevent our television from making an unfortunate economical alliance with American television. If the CBC is to complete this role it should receive annually a grant from Parliament based on a formula and this - in turn - is based on our own point of view, which is that of $5 per radio home and $20 per television home. This grant should be reviewed at five-year periods.

The present integrated broadcast system is essential to Canadian unity and should be continued. A separate enforcement body should enforce national broadcasting regulations for both the CBC and the private stations. This body should be responsible to the Board of Governors

of the CBC and not to CBC management. I am inclined to feel that this provides a rather close analogy perhaps to my own field. We see around us these days in our contemporary cities the squalor and the traffic problems that have been created by lack of planning. We have now imposed from the government level rather rigid zoning restrictions in the Province of Ontario which have appeal only to the level of the Ontario Municipal Board. It cannot be appealed beyond. We think in our field, perhaps, as architects and city planners, and I am speaking now as an architect, that we are dealing with a finite commodity, and it seems to us that the gentlemen charged with national radio and television well-being are also dealing with a finite commodity which cannot be replaced. Therefore it needs, because of its finite nature, regulation. We are not dealing with soap or that type of thing. Again, we need an Ontario musical board on the national level which will control and from which there will be right of appeal to perhaps not through the full recourses that might be expected in so many of the other fields.

The CBC should not force culture on anyone in radio. Its goal should be two-level programming so successfully used by the BBC in which a "choice" is available at all times in the light entertainment programmes and those of special interest or cultural value to different groups of people. In television provision should be made for alternative viewing for all Canadians

even though this involves the establishment of a second station in certain cities. We recognize that this is a very time-consuming proposition, but a goal to be achieved.

When this has been done the preparation of fine quality and of all Canadian programmes should be increased. Radio is good, and because of the development of television there should be no restriction of CBC radio programmes, and the quality of radio programmes should be improved.

Private stations should accept, we think, a largermeasure of the responsibility in achieving the national broadcasting goal. They should contribute and ensure greater use of Canadian talent as required by paragraph 21 of the Broadcasting Act. They should provide some programmes designed for serious listening and the time allowed for advertising should be reduced. The CBC should cooperate more effectively with producing groups of the arts and crafts and this would result in a very important role of these groups in the development of our culture. Better programmes for the CBC would give increased opportunities and rewards to musicians, singers, actors, dancers, choreographers, and writers and composers. The CBC should commission music, operas and ballets and plays for production, and this would encourage healthy competition in such fields and substantial prizes to encourage our younger musicians and choreographers and writers. The trend towards further concentration of programming in Montreal

and Toronto should be discouraged and CBC should nurture and encourage original works. Artists and writers should be represented on the CBC Board of Governors. The CBC should establish national advisory panels in each of the arts.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have read your brief, Mr. Parkin, and I think my colleagues have also done so, and you have given us a very brief but quite adequate summary of the main points in your brief. Perhaps I should have pointed out this morning the general statement as to our procedure here. We like to have the briefs summarized or read when they are short, as you have done, and then we will proceed to the questions. The questions are designed to bring out the exact point of view of the witness. They are also designed to put to that witness certain opposing points of view, and in putting them they are not to be taken and are not intended to indicate an opinion of the Commission which we have not yet reached.

-

-

-

MR. COYNE: I want to ask a few questions arising out of various statements in your brief. On page 1 you say:

> "For the purpose of financing the operations of the CBC, the Canadian Arts Council believes a distinction should be made between purely domestic programming and the International Service."

You are aware that distinction is made at the present time?

MR. PARKIN: Yes, I am aware that it is made in very large measure.

MR. COYNE: I think I am right in thinking that the international service, its financing and that sort of thing, is not within the terms of reference of this Commission. It is financed through the Department of External Affairs, or something of that sort.

MR. PARKIN: I wasn't aware of that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Put it this way: you are not recommending any change in what you take to be the present situation?

MR. PARKIN: No, sir.

MR. COYNE: Turning to your more specific financial recommendations at the top of page 2 where you recommend a statutory grant to the CBC of $5 per radio home and $20 per television home, are you able to tell us how you develop the specific figures?

MR. PARKIN: Our committee was largely composed of laymen. We did have the very good

fortune of having representation from the component society which is much more closely attuned to the field, but with a layman's intuition we arrived at what we felt would be the necessary budget projected into the immediate future, with the problem of the five-year review, with the approximate number of television sets available, due regard to the budget required for the CBC, arriving at these particular figures.

MR. COYNE: That was really what I was trying to get at. In other words, in the course of your brief you make a number of recommendations for either changes or extensions of service, almost all of them involving, as it inevitably would, the expending of further funds. In determining a figure such as $20 per television home, I suppose there are two alternative ways of doing it; one is to decide what services you want, and then compute what they cost; the other way would be simply to arrive at a figure which you think is practical and then try and put your programme within that figure. Do I understand from your answer that you took the first approach, that you were confident that all these various things you recommend could be financed on the basis of this $20 fee?

MR. PARKIN: No sir, I think that they would have to be financed in addition by certain other grants which would be necessary. We represent so many diverse views and different occupational groups that we are naturally anxious to present as

forceful as possible the rather varied nature of their demands.

MR. VOADEN: In the statements made before the Commission by the CBC and in discussions generally on the problem the figure of $3 or $4 per radio home and of $15 approximately per television home were widely broadcast, and since in our recommendations we were urging an extension and an improvement in the development of CBC service, we increased these figures to $5 and $20.

THE CHAIRMAN: On the general assumption that this ought to be enough to do what you recommend?

MR. VOADEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: In reaching these figures of $5 and $20, were you looking at their capital expenditures as well as their operating deficits?

MR. VOADEN: The third paragraph on page 2: "The council recommends also the need for funds for capital cost construction."

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Oh, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: On this particular proposition, the sort of thing that is bothering me, and I think maybe bothering the other Commissioners, is, what kind of yardstick is this business of "X" dollars per radio home or television home? Let me explain what I mean: if you had 15,000 television sets in Ottawa today and you were satisfied, for practical purposes, with the programme that is being delivered,

and supposing by the wave of a wand you had 100,000 television sets in Ottawa tomorrow; it would not cost the CBC one cent more to service the 100,000 than it costs for the 50,000. Why, therefore, do you tie your financial provisions into the notion of "per radio home" and "per television home". I don't want to appear to be knocking down the suggestion you are making here, because one of the things we have lacked more than anything else is some help on the basic problem of financing and we are very grateful to anybody who makes a try at it, but the particular one you have made raises these doubts in my mind, and I would like to have any comments on it which you may have.

MR. PARKIN: Mr. Chairman, this was the subject of a very great deal of discussion on our part. I think the saving grace in the entire suggestion is to be found in the five-year increment reviewal which would be involved in this picture, so that the supposed increase from 50,000 to 100,000 sets would be reviewed.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think my question really goes to a slightly different point from that. I can see if you were starting out to introduce television, you know that their services are going to spread throughout the country and the costs are going to rise, but we have now reached the situation where television is within reach of 80 per cent of the population. We have got some 2 million sets in existence in Canada.

Everyone seems to argue -- and we had some evidence on it yesterday -- that we are now reaching not exactly a stage of saturation, but a levelling off of the curve. Isn't it true that this kind of yardstick might be the only one you could find in the early days, but that we may be reaching a point where it is not an appropriate yardstick for financing purposes?

MR. VOADEN: What other yardstick is there?

THE CHAIRMAN: Some assessment of the cost of the service that you want. In other words, instead of saying, "Here is so much money" -- $20 multiplied by "X" television homes -- "Go ahead and spend it", you say, "This is the service we want. It will cost so much, and this should be provided." Isn't this a pretty rough method, and isn't the inevitable result that if you provide it the money will be spent whether it is needed or not, and is it any accurate reflection of the need?

MR. PARKIN: I can only suggest that the five-year review would be the only parliamentary safe-guard of how this somewhat arbitrary "per household" assessment or "per set" assessment --

THE CHAIRMAN: I must say this has the virtue of simplicity, but maybe our task is a little more difficult than that. I don't know whether it would solve it or not. We certainly have to struggle with it.

MR. VOADEN: This is something definite and concrete that you can lay your hands on and say it is a logical pattern on which to proceed -- at least in the first five years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, but just taking the present situation with 80 per cent coverage -- and that doesn't mean that 80 per cent of the families of Canada have sets; 80 per cent can have them if they want. I think something like 45 or 50 per cent have them, but the basic framework is there for the 80 per cent coverage. The increase in those basic costs has taken place; we are up to a level, but in the next five years, even, you are going to see, presumably, the 50 per cent rise to 80 per cent. Isn't that almost inescapably going to give -- assuming the present general level of programming is satisfactory -- isn't that almost inescapably going to give a quite substantial increase to the revenue, on this formula, of CBC without a corresponding increase in the CBC's business responsibility?

MR. PARKIN: We are at a rather critical point of the CBC's existence, and extra funds would highten the quality of the programme in the five-year period, the last three years of which might see a surplus of revenues which I think could be extremely intelligibly spent for encouragement of domestic talent, a reduction in the number of imported programmes, and the various other points alluded to in our brief.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You are saying, in effect, you believe there is sufficient talent in this country,artistic talent and writing talent, to provide considerably more programmes on the air than we have now?

MR. PARKIN: Very much so. I think we have certain short-comings in certain areas in the field of light comedy, for example. Perhaps due to our proverbial lack of sense of humour it would be very difficult for us to develop native comediens. But there are many areas in which, if funds were available, we could expend our resources. The manpower is there in terms of talent.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Well, I come back to the question which I think Mr. Turcotte asked almost at the opening of these sessions: we may have the talent in the matter of actors and singers, but have we the creative talent here as script writers?

MR. PARKIN: I am of the opinion that in recent months we have seen several excellent Canadian scripts exported both to the BBC and American networks. I think we can see this trend developing.

MR. VOADEN: I think it is true generally in terms of creative experience that where there is opportunity talent will finally be found.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but you have got a pretty hungry machine going for 365 days of the year for 16 hours a day, and it is going to take a tremendous amount of talent to feed that machine.

MR. VOADEN: It is a wonderful opportunity for writers.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: It is a wonderful opportunity, but do these writers exist in the numbers needed?

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Without falling to mediocrity?

MR. PARKIN: Yes. With permission to become slightly personal, I can think of at least one delegate in our own council here today, a playwright, who would like very much to be able to devote his whole time to the field of creative writing, but, like so many Canadians, and other 20,000 members perhaps the vast majority have to sustain themselves in some other field of activity until they have the opportunity to give full reign to their creative abilities.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: So that you feel there is no doubt that the talent exists in this country?

MR. PARKIN: Yes. The Canadian Arts Council and the various Canadian artists do not ask for a government hand-out. The patron of old is gone. The Rennaissance idea of the princely patron and the church no longer exists. . There is only one patron left in any substantial degree in this country, and that is the government itself. The CBC for years has been the greatest patron of the arts we have seen. Until the hoped for arrival of a Canada Council, we have greeted everything the CBC has done with open arms. There is no one else in Canada to assume this task on behalf of the professional artist in this country.

THE CHAIRMAN: You don't suggest they don't have their flops, though, do you -- the CBC?

MR. PARKIN: We have our bankruptcies at business, too, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: But going back to this financial business, let us accept for the moment, and for the sake of argument, the desirability of improving and new developments, and the kind of thing you have been discussing with Mr. Stewart; if there was some way of assessing in dollars and cents as to cost -- let us say at the present stage it costs $30 million, 15 times 2 million sets which happen to exist, and suppose you could make some assessment of the projection over the next five years, year by year, the actual programme and what it was going to cost, with necessary assumptions about the value of the dollar and so forth; which way it might go, up or down, doesn't matter; the provision of these annual mounts could equally well be done by statutory grant and those annual amounts might actually bear a much closer relationship to the needs than any theoretical multiplication of the number of sets that may exist.

MR. PARKIN: That is conceivable.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your multiplication business may be too little or too much.

COMMISSION STEWART: Your population is increasing at the rate of 400,000 a year. If that increase in population means an increase in television sets, and the increase in population is maintaining only the larger centres, the increase in costs to CBC would be negligible, but if that

population increase is dispersed throughout the length and breadth of the country, the costs would be enormous. You could either have on the basis of taking a "per set" amount much too much money going to the CBC, or even too little, depending on the manner in which your population is dispersed throughout the country.

MR. PARKIN: I think this viewpoint of mine might be somewhat naive. At least, I put it forward that there is during the next several years such an opportunity to raise the standards of CBC radio and television, particularly perhaps the latter, that the possibility of them having too much money is a somewhat theoretical situation. Beyond that period, yes, but we have such a long way to go in which CBC, fulfilling a measure that a Canadian Council would, as the great Canadian patron of the arts, that it certainly would not come within the first five years.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go on.

MR. PARKIN: Another point that occurs to me to be basic to our philosophy is that these people, that Canadians, should have an opportunity for alternative listening and viewing, and that they should not have to listen to an opera or that they should not have to listen to I Love Lucy and that every Canadian should have a choice between the programme designed for specialist groups and a programme designed for those who like light entertainment, and the situation at the present time is that so many Canadians have to listen or to view only one type of programme, is from our point of view most unsatisfactory, and I think we could say, as a consequence of rapidly rising revenues in the next five years, it is infinitely valuable in the enabling of CBC to develop a second network in television and carry these two basic networks.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are thinking of the alternative being provided by the CBC rather than -- you see the existing stations in Canada -- I think it is eight CBC television and twenty-five or twenty-six privately owned in our network operation. This is the pattern that was followed in radio and has applied up to now in television, and your suggestion of a separate CBC network, that could, I suggest, be done with this same combination of public and private ownership.

MR. PARKIN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I thought you were suggesting the CBC rush out and open twenty-five new stations. On page 5 of your brief, the first paragraph, alternative viewing in television, you say:

> "At the present time, groups interested in serious entertainment are not well served by CBC television. Most of the programmes designed for such groups, like The Concert Hour, Folio, and This Week, are presented, in many areas, late in the evening. The best viewing hours go to imported U.S. commercial programmes, and to Canadian programmes of a light popular nature designed to rival them and attract Canadian viewers.
>
> "As an approach to two-level programming in television, the CBC should make sure that alternative viewing, from private stations, U.S. stations, or, ultimately, and most desirably, a second CBC network, is possible for all Canadians."

MR. COYNE: I might turn to the next subject quoted in the brief, The Control and regulation of private radio and television stations , and I will put my question in this way. I should have thought that professional people concerned with the creative arts in the field of ideas would have been the most vociferous advocates of freedom of trade in its broadest

sense. I wonder if you could expand a little on what you regard as the purpose of a tariff in this line.

MR. PARKIN: In the first respect, I think as an architect. Until the 1920's, I think I am right in saying, there was no tariff on the import of drawings from the United States. The consequence was King St. This is not referring to Mr. Stewart's bank. The Bank of Toronto imported the plans for their building from the firm of Hastings, who built the New York Public Library. I think at that time the import duties placed made it necessary for the use of Canadian architects. The assessment, I believe, the duty is, I believe, one-quarter of the cost of the building. In other words, the importations of plans for a million dollar building would be $200,000, and the cost of the paper involved would be $50. The happy result is, I think, a finer building done by a firm of Canadian builders. However, although art is a national expression, certainly with those facts, one doubts the wisdom of creating a definite Canadian art. We are not dealing with art in the sense of developing a gothic or rennaissance period. But at the outset art needs protection as any other field of activity. Mr. LeRoy has mentioned this in his brief and I would like him to say one or two words in this regard.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps a convenient way of doing that -- the same point is

made in their brief and we may hear him at that time, if it is agreeable to you. The thing you are talking about is architects' drawings -- and that is not a tariff at all; that is a straight embargo.

MR. PARKIN: I am not a lawyer; I do not know the difference between a tariff and an embargo, where it is in the stratospheric levels it becomes a tariff.

MR. COYNE: I suppose there are two things tariffs can achieve. Let us think of the programme in the broader sense. One is to keep foreign trade cut altogether by such a prohibitive level. I take it you wouldn't defend the prohibition of imports from abroad? The other thing, I think, is not to prohibit the importing but to make the importation very much more expensive?

MR. PARKIN: I think that would be our view.

MR. COYNE: Looking again at that subject, specifically in relation to radio and television, if the import of programmes becomes very much more expensive who pays the extra expense? Aren't you adding materially to the overall cost to the Canadian public of its radio and television fares?

MR. PARKIN: Is there not again an analogy to what has happened to Time Magazine and the Readers Digest in an attempt to foster Canadian journalism?

THE CHAIRMAN: My point is this. That

is the principal concern this Commission has before it, or one of them -- what is the amount of money the Canadian people should devote to these performances? If there is something we have in mind, I would suggest to you, the artificial increase in the amount of money that may be required for certain performances as a result of a tariff, on the type of thing set up, it might not be altogether justified, looking at the public interest and the interest of private and public funds.

MR. PARKIN: It would be justified if it resulted in increased employment and created opportunity for people who were connected with the radio and television industry in Canada. This is the principle of the tariff. You have put up your wall and Canadianism operates behind the wall.

MR. COYNE: But if there is an increased cost in putting up the wall and some expense --

MR. PARKIN: We pay more for our automobiles in Canada but we are prepared to do this in order to foster the automobile industry in Canada.

MR. COYNE: But if you are going to devote thirty or forty million dollars to the public side of this business, there may be an answer to this, but why increase the amount of that money that you are devoting to some performances and therefore cut down the amount for the buying of others?

MR. PARKIN: The tariff would be directed against inferior programmes. There would be no prohibition of live programmes. These are

recorded programmes and there would be, as I understand, an attempt to cherish and encourage the best that Canada has along with the United States and Britain and Australia.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that inferior point, is the recorded programme necessarily inferior to the developments that are taking place in reference to art, and with the development of high fidelity which we have heard about -- I am not talking about the question of creating Canadian employment, I am talking about the question of quality of programmes. You used the word "inferior"?

MR. PARKIN: Inferior in respect of content.

THE CHAIRMAN: Leaving aside the desirability of employing Canadian artists and so on would a high fidelity recording of Beethoven's symphony by the Philadelphia Orchestra be inferior to a recording by the Toronto Symphony?

MR. VOADEN: This is answered on page 10 of our brief, where we say the CBC should pursue an active policy of distributing preserved performances of the best of Canadian programmes, both radio and television to other countries. The culture which we are developing should not be kept within our borders; it should be known to the world.

Our study has recommended in para. 3 of No. 3:

> " . . . wherever possible, reciprocal agreements with those countries which now, or may later, establish programme tariffs."

Reciprocal agreements can be entered into with other countries, and therefore if the CBC knows of an American programme, an American recording of Beethoven's Symphony, they would make some attempt to bring that programme in in exchange for a Canadian programme which is comparable.

MR. COYNE: Surely you don't mean that we should only permit American programmes to come in here to the extent that the Americans are prepared to import Canadian programmes? At the moment Americans are very indifferent to Canadian programmes. Surely , if that policy is followed we are cutting off our nose to spite our face. If we could have American programmes until such time as the American public are interested in Canadian programmes that is something else again.

MR. VOADEN: In some instances the CBC programmes receive awards, and this is recognized among the intelligent section of the American public. What the CBC is doing is held in very high regard.

MR. COYNE: As a practical man you must admit that there is not the sort of widespread demand for Canadian programmes as there is for American, and even limiting yourself to the better programmes, if you like, in Canada. If you say only do this on a reciprocal basis, what we are doing is limiting ourselves.

MR. VOADEN: We are not speaking of live programmes. These are recorded programmes.

MR. COYNE: I think most of the American programmes we see on the CBC network are film programmes.

MR. VOADEN: I think we will have to call in Mr. Leroy to speak on that.

MR. COYNE: I think it would be more satisfactory to pursue this with the next witness.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is only one more question I would like to put to this group. I can see how it would be effective for the artists and architects and others, these tariffs, or whatever it is, but it would be different for the Canadian people. You say to use native talent. Here we are a group of sixteen million people beside a very active, dynamic one hundred and sixty-five million people, even allowing Dr. Lower's point, we have to be careful about the amount of American importation brought in. There is a very rich fare down there available if we use it intelligently. But if you put up what amounts to a barrier, or a retribution, what are we left with to take its place? Something that is as good?

MR. VOADEN: In the final instance nothing really is more important than that we remain as Canadians and I would agree more fully and richly as Canadians. This is really tremendously important and if there was a device like this you have an increasing number of Canadian artists working over the subject matter of Canadian life and re-interpreting it for our own people and for other countries then. This is very important.

MR. COYNE: Mr. Voaden, just along that line Dr. Lower yesterday while admitting the desirability of the developments you speak of and I do not think anyone can intelligently dispute them, said that he would never recommend the erection of any Chinese wall around Canada which would exclude or may exclude things from outside. I put it to you as to whether or not the type of scheme that you suggest, tariffs, quotas, reciprocal agreements does not have a good deal of the Chinese wall to it.

MR. VOADEN: It certainly worked with architecture.

MR. COYNE: In the sense in which it was put to us yesterday.

MR. VOADEN: It has certainly worked with architecture.

THE CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of their organization.

MR. PARKIN: And the engineer. The Chinese wall was finally breached though, was it not?

THE CHAIRMAN: By breaking it down.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: There is one point I want to get clear in my mind; during the discussion you have been talking about programmes of quality or superior programmes. Now, we are dealing with national interests in which everybody is vitally interested and we are also dealing in the matter of taste and what may be superior to you may be inferior to your next door neighbour and I do not think, I do not really feel that we can qualify a statement when you are dealing with the matter of national taste in which every individual Canadian is concerned and qualify it to inferior or superior. I will venture the statement that quality defies universal interpretation.

MR. VOADEN: You have in the story of the development of the world such a thing as the cultural, the liberal culture which is carried down from the time of the Greeks and Romans; there is such a thing as great music and great drama and so on and when you speak of this person's taste as against that person's taste, there are certain absolute values with regard to what is good. I think we are all aware of the fact that there are art forms appearing all the time, certain types of current or modern jazz as demonstrated at Stratford this summer are very generally significant but in our educational system there are certain things which we teach that are good and those are the lines when you speak of taste, those are the lines that you follow, the heritage of

culture that has come down to us.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but of course this Commission is asked to deal with a national problem in which everybody is interested and I think we have got to take into consideration the varieties, the different classifications of taste.

MR. VOADEN: I think we admit this in our basic suggestion that there should be, if possible, two levels of entertainment available at all times.

THE CHAIRMAN: But this is prohibiting in effect or retarding imports;is the protectionist device applicable to art? You are drawing an analogy with a motor car and, just to take the thing through, is it perhaps not more closely analogous to the import of capital?

MR. PARKIN: I would suggest that some of the finest arts in the past have flourished where there has been a kind of protective tariff, a form of isolation,the Buddist culture of the East, the former glories of Japanese art which are being inundated and perverted by the mass of so-called Western art and much of it is very shoddy and there is great danger of some of these great cultures suffering. I think it is possible for that to develop and flourish and history I think says so; it is possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the historical references you have been making have been basically developments of the art by method of patronage, by the method of subsidization and I am suggesting to you that your

point is a strong one when you say that the business of over the years the state has become the patron and we have to pay a cost if we want to keep Canadian and develop but that technique is quite different from the notion of preventing the outside flow of things into Canada for the protection and greater ease of Canadian artists.

MR. PARKIN: I think the underlying theme of the state, the new patron, is the basis of our entire statement that when we speak of $40 million or $50 million or $60 million, these astronomical figures, we do so quite simply in the idea of providing so many hours worth of entertainment but that the CBC is perhaps, it is today the largest single patron of the arts and this must be carried on, this must be enhanced in every conceivable way.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just suggest to you that when you are suggesting that there should be a curtailment of the free trade in art the artists are fast becoming business men.

MR. VOADEN: Shaw was a wonderful business man and also a very great artist. I think the two can go together.

MR. PARKIN: I am rather afraid so many of our great artists today are business men and so many artists of the past have been business men, to their credit.

MR. COYNE: I would like to turn, Mr. Parkin, to the somehwat different subject which arises on

page 7 after you have been setting forth your views as to the control and regulation of radio and television stations, in paragraph 8 you speak of better Sunday programmes and you say:

> "It is recommended that a regulation barring the use of spot announcements on Sunday should be passed, applicable to all radio stations, both CBC and privately-owned. Such a regulation would result in a less commercial and higher programme standard on Sunday, more suitable for family listening and viewing."

You say such a regulation would result in this and I put it to you what your views would be if the result of the regulation was not as you suggest but that the private radio and television stations simply decided not to broadcast on Sunday which would make very real sense if they are not deriving any revenue?

MR. VOADEN: They would not derive revenue, the spot announcement comes every two and a half minutes after a popular record but this would not include a piece of music played for 10 or 15 minutes and an announcement at the end of that, some advertising at the end of a quarter or a half hour period.

MR. COYNE: So what you are suggesting here is simply that spot announcements as such be forbidden.

MR. VOADEN: On Sunday, yes, this constant breaking of the pattern of broadcasting for commercials, this I understand is what is meant by spot announcements.

MR. COYNE: I am not quite sure, I think the way it has been put to us is that spot announcements are different from sponsored programmes. In other words, where a sponsor buys a programme and introduces his advertising into the course of that programme, that is not a spot announcement; a spot announcement is something that is not related to a particular programme but is put in between programmes or something of that kind.

MR. VOADEN: This would work out the same way. I recall a programme over CFRB in which Heintzman's have a quarter of hour fairly good music and in this quarter hour, at the end they say something about what they do and then close.

MR. COYNE: Is your point really this, there should be less advertising on Sunday?

MR. VOADEN: Yes.

MR. COYNE: But you are not advocating complete elimination?

MR. VOADEN: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you are not concerned really about spot announcements but where the spots come?

MR. VOADEN: Exactly.

MR. COYNE: Well then, turning to page 9, paragraph 10 which deals with the CBC and its

adult audience and you say the CBC should cultivate its adult audience by repeating its best programmes once and the word that rather intrigues me and I would appreciate your explanation of is "once"?

MR. VOADEN: "At least once" it should have been.

MR. COYNE: You may put it this way then, do you think it is of value to be able to repeat worth while programmes any number of times?

MR. VOADEN: Yes, the CBC has done this on occasion but in England there is a definite pattern, there is a time in which, say a Sunday programme that is a worth while programme is repeated and one knows then and adjust one's living pattern for that week to that knowledge.

MR. COYNE: Are you familiar with the arrangement which the BBC has with its performers as to the cost that is involved?

MR. VOADEN: I think Mr. LeRoy will tell you that.

MR. COYNE: It has been suggested to us that one of the serious difficulties in both the repetition of programmes and the export of programmes is the very restrictive arrangements which some of the union contracts made between CBC and some of its groups --

MR. VOADEN: If this point is not in the next brief perhaps Mr. LeRoy will speak to it now.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will get to him later on this point.

MR. COYNE: It is a point for someone rather than yourself to speak on then. Then on page 11 you say under No. 14:

> "The CBC's valuable collaboration with musical organizations, such as our symphony orchestras, should be continued and increased. This collaboration should be extended more frequently to the new medium of television."

It has been put to us that there are certain things which can be done equally well on radio and television, it is very much cheaper to do them on radio and if you do them on radio then you have more funds available for other things which are more appropriately adapted to television.

-

-

-

-

One of the type of programmes that has been represented to us that can quite properly be done on radio is the type of programmes by symphony orchestras, for example.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has even gone further sometimes than that and we have had it said that television is at a positive disadvantage in dealing with the attraction of the attention of the listener in an attempt to make something lively appear on the screen.

MR. COYNE: In the next paragraph you refer to that aspect of it, "There should be continued experimentation to prevent the telecast from being disturbing visually to the 'live' as well as to the viewing audience, and to improve the television pictures and the quality and fidelity of sound": but would you care to comment on the general proposition?

MR. VOADEN: Mr. Chairman, Dr. Boyd Neel is a member of our Commission and when we first discussed this point he was rather strongly of the opinion that radio was the best medium for music and not television -- television was not a medium suitable for music. However, in discussing it with him we pointed out that so many people now watch television almost exclusively and they would be losing opportunities to hear good music. We suggested that it is a problem of technical difficulties, which could be met, and we finally persuaded him to leave the point as it is worded here. That is to say, we recognize, as in the

next paragraph, that the radio will always remain a deeply satisfying medium for the broadcasting of music but we don't want to close the door on music via the medium of television. We think that the Concert Hour, for example, has played a very useful and very valuable part. Of course, not as much perhaps as ballet and opera which have a more visual interest, but I would hate to think, and I think the members of the committee would agree with me, that we should be closing the door on music in television.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you saying really that television has to have a balance of fare and must have some good music in it?

MR. VOADEN: Yes, I think there is something to be said also for a great personality in music -- a great performer -- for instance, the farmer in Northern Saskatchewan should be able to see Curzon playing. I think it is something to watch his fingers and his concentration -- I think this is an experience which is valuable.

MR. COYNE: Just to go back for a moment to something you said on the principle of the two-level programming which I didn't follow up before -- I take it that you would think it is desirable to have, in in effect, two separate networks if you like, one of which concentrates on light entertainment and one of them concentrating on the more serious matters; you advocate that as being good programming?

MR. VOADEN: Yes.

MR. COYNE: A moment ago you pointed out that a lot of people today sit down to a television set and that they cannot be expected to turn on the radio set for a good musical programme that they cannot hear and see on the television set. It has been put to us that one of the functions of good programming is to raise the general level of appreciation of such matters as good music, and the like, and one way you can do that is by interspersing a variety of programmes over a single network, so that the man who watches I Love Lucy let us say, because he likes I Love Lucy, is more likely to hear the Toronto Symphony Orchestra if it comes on immediately afterwards, on the same channel. Would you not agree that if you strictly divide your programme in a two-level way as you suggest that you are really likely to limit your serious programmes to an already dedicated group of listeners?

MR. VOADEN: You are familiar with the pattern of the British Broadcasting System -- the Home Service, for example, has very good symphony programmes and extremely well produced plays -- good plays -- it also has a variety broadcast and it also has some good talks. In other words, in each of the levels there is an up and down level to cope with this. Thus the Light Programme is not entirely light, the Home Service is not entirely medium, the Third Programme is not entirely the reverse.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have also heard that the Third Programme is virtually unknown outside of these limited people who want to tune into it anyway.

MR. COYNE: You are introducing really a choice between the Light Programme and the Home Programme?

MR. VOADEN: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Not just between the Light Programme and the Third Programme?

MR. VOADEN: That is right.

MR. COYNE: I see. Well then, just one final point having to do with your suggestion of advisory panels in association with the CBC programming department in particular. Someone was keeping a count of the number of advisory panels that have been recommended to the Commission in its hearings to date, and I think it is up to 41 or 42, something of that kind. Do you think there would be the tendency to develop a very cumbersome organization if the CBC was to have an advisory panel in each and every type of special interest, if you like, which takes an interest in these matters of radio and television?

MR. VOADEN: We are only concerned here, as a matter of fact the second section of the brief deals with the specific problems the CBC has in relation to our cultural groups in Canada, and our main contention is that CBC would profit and the artistic groups in Canada would profit from a much closer liaison and I would see these panels as a means by which that closer liaison can be achieved.

Certainly in the arts we feel it is very important.

MR. COYNE: And I suppose you might reach the point in this connection that the arts are more closely connected with not only the content of programmes but with their production?

MR. VOADEN: Yes.

MR. COYNE: Direction and everything else of all types of programmes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We really have been toying with the idea of eliminating criticism of the CBC and having everybody in Canada on these advisory councils. That remark was not meant to be taken seriously. Well, gentlemen, we have asked our questions and we thank you ladies and gentlemen, for coming and for preparing an extensive brief and for presenting it as well as you have.

THE CANADIAN COUNCIL OF AUTHORS

AND ARTISTS

Appearances:

| | |
|---|---|
| Mr. Neil LeRoy | President |
| Mr. Louis Belanger | First Vice-President |
| Mr. Art Macdonald | Secretary |

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief will be from the Canadian Council of Authors and Artists, and Mr. Neil LeRoy is the president, and is presenting the brief.

EXHIBIT NO. 211 - Brief of the Canadian Council of Authors and Artists.

MR. LeROY: First of all, may I say I should like to comment on a few errors and say that our brief was written deliberately for this Commission and of course it was in April and there are some points which have been changed in the meantime, some figures and statistics, so first of all, I would like to say we are representing 2,700 French and English-speaking performers and writers in television and radio and theatre.

THE CHAIRMAN: Don't tell me the total number has risen in three or four months?

MR. LeROY: It has, sir, and may we say that we do not encompass all the performers in Canada. More rightly our organization maintains a relationship with all peoples in Canada and, of course, great use is made of other talent that

may not be encompassed by our Council. We have an association located in Vancouver, one in Winnipeg, one in Toronto, Montreal and Quebec City, being the main production centres from which programmes do emanate through our national service. Our brief I may say was not prepared by a small group of people in Toronto -- it was circulated throughout all our associations, presented to the general membership and it was only after a series of presentations and the revising of documents that we finally arrived at the document submitted to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: If I may interject here, would you speak just a little louder because the accoustics are not too good and I think some people are having difficulty hearing you, Mr. LeRoy.

MR. LeROY: I will indeed. I have been hidden behind a radio microphone too long. If I may touch on No. 1 which is our recommendation concerning the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, we believe in the ideal of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, yet we have some criticisms. With regard to the matter of the regulatory body which seems to have been of very great concern to everybody who is interested in our national system and in our local stations, it is our viewpoint and we have listened to some of the statements which have been made saying that there is a form of competition existing, it is our belief and it has always been our understanding that broadcasting in Canada was formulated as a partnership and the partnership

has specific areas of operation. It is our viewpoint that there is only one person operating a network in Canada and that is the CBC and it is a national responsibility and the partners are made up of a great number of broadcasting stations who, not all of them are part of this network, but who in many cases have made very worth-while contributions in the past.

The areas of competition we fail to see, because under a proper operation -- and we don't say there have not been times where it is not operated properly -- the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, for the provision of making it worth while to operate a private station, has, in radio, kept out of the area of local advertising. So, it is not competing in that particular area. It provides, it is true, and carries commercial programmes, but where these are carried these stations are part of the network and benefit from the moneys accruing from the sales of those programmes, and agreement is reached on a share basis.

When it comes to regulations, surely if the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has a responsibility for the national network it must also have the position of regulating the handling of that network. I cannot see how, therefore, they are ruling unfairly. I do think a good deal -- and we all think on our council -- that a good deal of confusion has arisen perhaps because in the minds of many people it is hard to clearly divide the responsibilities of the Chairman of the Board of Governors and the General Manager of the CBC. I believe there has been some confusion here. I believe that many organizations in Canada and many peoples in Canada believe that Mr. Davidson Dunton is the general manager of the CBC. While we are well aware that they have a very forceful and strong general manager, who may at various times differ

with Mr. Davidson Dunton on his attitudes concerning how the management is best operated, we see the Board of Governors as establishing certain policies and being responsible for certain regulation, but not being involved in the actual management of the network. This is a different department.

There is another phase,that we find it difficult to state that there is a competitive position: traditionally the operation of a network is a very unprofitable operation. Networks which we have south of the border and in other countries, if it was not for their ownership of stations, they would operate at a tremendous loss. It is not an economically sound operation to operate a network. I cannot see private enterprise being overly interested in operating something that is not profitable even if this desire had been expressed. We find quite often that there have been statements made that particular networks were required, and they regret having to go to the CBC, or the Board of Governors, to get permission. This is because you can take sections of network operation and make them profitable at times, but if you jump in when it is profitable and withdraw the service when it is not, we do not think it is in the national interest. Therefore we are delighted we have a national organization responsible for the continual maintenance of this network.

We do see the possibility of the need of a second regulatory body, but we do not think it

is in the field of national broadcasting. We might recommend that the C.A.R.T.B. as a trade association, extend its activities a little by setting up a regulatory body which may consult with our national regulatory body for some guidance not only on good taste, but on questions of trade and competition. I think the C.A.R.T.B. would admit that it is the fear -- again using the word "competition" -- of the competition. Although we regard them as having two totally different functions, they are competitive in some areas because they take away dollars from another area, but we do not think this is necessarily a wrong thing. I suppose you could say a shoe store is in competition with a candy store because they are both competing for a dollar. If C.A.R.T.B. set up a regulatory body which governed good taste and took some notice of the public opinion in the matters of broadcasting, and from that body of theirs were permitted to appear before the regulatory body in the same way as CBC management representative is permitted to appear, this may have some merit, but we would recommend no change in the current regulatory body. We think it is operated extremely well and fairly, but we do think it should have a little more force. We think the CBC has been under such continual criticism from various sources in this country that they have developed a supersensitive attitude and have bent

over to be unduly nice where a firm hand is required in many cases. We know and can substantiate with examples if we are asked questions that there have been many cases of regulations being broken and may I say it is not just a case of the private stations breaking regulations; there are examples of the CBC breaking the regulations which have been set. Sometimes these things are done deliberately, we believe, to test regulations. As we know, in other phases of our life certain laws become obsolete and not geared to the times, and I believe this has happened with many broadcasting regulations, and therefore whenever anybody gets a little tired of a particular regulation and thinks it is outdated, they proceed to break it, and there is a meeting about it, and a little change in the application.

THE CHAIRMAN: The same as driving at 60 miles an hour when the speed limit was 50 -- you try it out.

MR. LeROY: I see there is some thought being given to raising it to 60 in some areas. When we turn to the matter of financing, may I say to start with I would like to strike out on page 3 of our brief the paragraph starting, "We believe these amounts provide proper funds..." etc.; that paragraph. I would like that deleted and then we will explain why. It seems that a great many people are presenting to this Commission a similar form of financing, and we regard it purely as a formula

because until your hearings are complete and the recommendations are in and assessed as to what seems to be the proper thing to have in this country, and how expensive our broadcasting system should be, it is impossible to arrive at a figure unless you are simply going to find a figure to put the particular recommendations you are making, and we do not pretend to think that our recommendations are the beginning and end. There are many other organizations who will have recommendations, and we could not gear a financial figure to fit an unknown, but we do believe a formula can be offered. In the past the only other formulas we seem to have heard of are a licensing system, which for one thing was unpopular, and secondly, it left many of us in the position of making no contribution whatsoever to something that is a national service. There are many examples of national services and local services and professional services that we may not all use, but we do feel a responsibility to contribute towards those things. I, personally, have not been in a public library for over 20 years. I go to private enterprise for my reading, but I certainly do not believe we should drop our public libraries. I believe it is an important service which we all should enjoy. Why, then, do we fix it to a number of radio homes or a number of TV sets? Frankly, it is a convenient formula. We think it is geared to some extent to the interest

in the service provided. We do know that when consideration is given to opening up a new area that there is some possibility of assessing from past experience the number of sets that may go into that area because of bringing service to that area. In the long run it is not a formula that perhaps could be used forever; but perhaps the formula could be used with adjustments in the figures. We suggest this formula should be an all-encompassing formula. We think the formula should also cover the cost of expenditures. We believe that any organization can best gear service to a figure which can be prognosticated, and we believe this is a fairly simple one to work from.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. LeRoy, you were present, I think, when we were raising some questions on this before.

MR. LeROY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I wish you would feel free to comment on them without us having to repeat them. I can see the clear-cut relationship between the formula and the extension into new areas. I think that is as good a rough and ready method of doing it as you can bring out.

MR. LeROY: I think you brought up earlier this figuring up to some staggering amounts of money, perhaps in excess of what would be required to provide the service to the country.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was more concerned with the problem that the formula which may have been necessary during the period of geographical extension

of the television system may not be so apt or appropriate a formula when you are in a period where you are not going to have these geographical extensions.

MR. LeROY: This is true, sir, and that is why we believe it should be reviewed in four or five years. The reason for this, in trying to expand it over that period of years we would like some formula that would take us away from the business of being subject to annual grants and annual conditions. We believe there is a danger in this in so far as you cannot project your future. You cannot plan properly if there is some doubt as to whether you are going to get any money at all, and we do believe that the CBC has had many sad moments, and I think they are going through a sad moment now, with great plans and everybody clamouring for a great deal, and right now they don't know where the money is coming from, and I am quite sure they are hanging on the ropes waiting your findings here.

-

-

-

-

And just to add that we are simply making a formal presentation that seems to have more merit and there I think I should stop.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to say we thoroughly appreciate that there is a corps of people working on the whole financial front to try and provide a financing scheme for this undertaking and it must be hopeless for anyone outside to do it and any help I get from anyone is of very much value.

MR. LeROY: I would like to touch on two or three items and even if I do not go into them too much, as I am sure you are going into a lengthy discussion on the matter of past performance. In the matter of licensees we make a recommendation there. It is not an important amount of money but we think it is a matter of principle that the corporation should take under general review. In the matter of the tax we would like to see the tax removed because we think it necessary to see sets placed in the home if it will give encouragement to a larger ownership of the sets. Whether that 15 per cent tax will make that difference or not I don't know. If we feel it would be wise to withdraw some of the tax and to leave some because we think a little bit of money should be going into the government coffer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave that, so we don't have to come back to it, is the acquisition of a television set or a radio set, except within very wide limits, very responsive to price? It seems to me you go through the country and see

aerials and there seems to be more of them in the poorer districts than elsewhere. I would doubt myself whether there is much difference that this 15 per cent would make to the point you are making here. At the moment, with two million receivers in Canada, We haven't done too badly with the tax.

MR. LeROY: I don't put too much emphasis on this. The picture, such as you point out, in this day and age it is too easy for us to acquire things without any money. You simply acquire things without any money and hope it will turn out well. On the matter of tariff, I wonder if I might pass over that because --

THE CHAIRMAN: We might leave that for questioning because it is almost the same point as in the other brief.

MR. LeROY: But I have some other views.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good.

MR. LeROY: I know you gentlemen have read our brief so I do not see any particular point in labouring our brief. Perhaps your questioning period will bring out the necessary information or further information on some of the areas.

There is one thing we have not covered in our brief. There is one thing I have noticed which is not, at least as far as I have read, does not appear to have played a big part in these hearings today. That is the matter of great importance, of films in the area of television. I think in a full examination of broadcasting in Canada and the

responsibilities of our national system to provide a service that we must give very grave consideration to the matter of films. We must assert what facilities we have in this country. It seems to me it could be most useful if this hearing could hear from such associations as the Independent Film Producers, for instance. There are a number of organizations concerned with film and film development in Canada and, of course in Canada we have our own National Film Board, and at present it would appear that we have worked with the facilities we have here in Canada and have been able to assist them very well. At the moment we are not able to provide in the area of film the quality and quantity of film required for proper Canadian programming. The gamble, the amount of money required in producing is in some cases rather enormous. No film can be produced to be presented in Canada only without being very very expensive as a programme. We will have to look to other fields and create programmes that are acceptable elsewhere as a film. We have, I believe, a growing group of technicians in Canada in this field, but not anything comparable to other film producing centres. We have talent here, and may I say, in that field there are opportunities to others to produce films because -- one, talent is available at lower cost than it is, say, south of the border. Two, we have an advantage of being able to encourage American companies to come to this country with their know-how in this field. What makes it

attractive to them is this -- that they set up a Canadian company here and do not operate as an American company on location, they are then in the position of having produced a film in a country that has freedom of entry into many soft money areas. For instance there are quotas existing in England and other countries and there is an advantage in being able to get in under these quotas. I would further recommend that the National Broadcasting system must have the greatest freedom to investigate film facilities in Canada, and if it is necessary develop film interests and have the greatest freedom to purchase and develop film markets here. It would be impossible in our case for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to take full responsibility for television in this country unless it had greater freedom in the area of film production and film purchase. I don't pretend to be familiar with any regulations or laws in this area -- whether some particular department has laid over matters of obtaining film and so on -- this is something someone else would have to investigate, but I do think it is a most important area and I do believe there are great opportunities to develop films in Canada and we can give them encouragement because of the free entry of our films into countries without embargoes facing them and because of the great talent we have. We have a national system of fine facilities, limited facilities that will have to turn more and more to film and therefore

to go into film production and if that film is of high quality the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation will certainly be one of the first customers for anyone who wants to move into this new and interesting field.

We have one comment which I skipped over regarding penalties under an enforcement body. One, we think there has been an unfortunate past association in relation to the CBC also being the police force also being the police force. The two bodies are the same in effect. I assume you have had views expressed on this before so I won't labour it.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have had that point but don't hesitate to mention it.

MR. LeROY: I will pass on simply commenting on it and go on to say one thing we find somewhat peculiar in the setting up, while it is a regulatory body that there only seems to be one punishment. You are either told to stop being a bad boy or your license is taken away. We think there might be some intermediate punishment somewhere. It might well be that a system of fines is an approach to the matter. We do think that to deprive a person of their license is far too drastic.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are probably thinking of procedure something like that of section 5 of the Radio Act, a summary conviction Act for breach of regulation. Would you think that, at least in a limited area would also provide something in the nature in the right of an appeal? What I am

thinking of is this. There must be times when there is a disagreement between a private station and the CBC as to the interpretation of the regulation and its application and without any rancour, say, let us take it to court and let some judicial mind say whether it does or does not fall into this regulation. So you do get an appeal in that limited way.

MR. LeROY: In regard to the Board of Governors we hold them in the same high esteem and we would like to feel that their role should be almost similar to that of an appointment to the bench.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know whether you could get governors for a permanent appointment.

MR. LeROY: I know someone mentioned there was a way of removing them and some thought was given whether this was a bad thing. I have never heard of one being removed except by a hearse.

The matter of facilities we have dealt with in great length. We have dealt with the opportunities and rewards to musicians, singers, actors, dancers, composers, choreographers and writers. Unfortunately all these things seem to link back to money. And we have found that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation at the moment, quite frankly, when we see them, they say, yes, it is a splendid idea but where do we get the money? We must admit in many cases this is the answer we cannot meet. But we do think there has been considerable wastage. From the point of view that

that they have had to make do and because there were not sufficient funds to do a job properly, make-shift arrangements were made and make-shift arrangements in the long run are expensive arrangements. We think the corporation in recent times have been faced with this problem. We think the manager of the corporation and for that matter the Board of Governors, are aware of this situation and regret it very much but unfortunately they are over the barrell in economic factors and there is no provision to carry it out.

There is a matter I would like to touch on again and say there should be no sponsorship of programmes on public affairs on radio and television, not mentioning individual stations. We believe that this is a national service and we have great fears of the effect of sponsorship on the system on opinion and the expressing and giving of certain news stories, from actual experience, because many of us work in this field and we have felt its effect in the past. Certainly, I am not going to say something derogatory about the field in which my sponsor is represented.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I just clear that up. You are not making the point that there is a direct attempt to get you to change your story.

MR. LeROY: In many cases it is self preservation.

THE CHAIRMAN: In many cases you feel if this man is paying the shot you had better be a

little gentle.

MR. LeROY: Yes, another thing we find is that the station had pressure brought to bear by the sponsor. There is an editing job done by the sponsor or advertising agency. We regret to say this has been brought on the CBC on various programmes where there has been sponsorship. I however honestly think there has been the attempt to resist these pressures but continual pressure is exerted by a number of cliques cannot help to have their effect. We do believe that certain things have not been seen or heard by the Canadian public because a particular sponsor did not want those things seen or heard and we think this is unfortunate on our national network. We do not think it so important at the community level with a variety of stations. If you cannot get it on one you carry it over to another. However, in our national system we have not got this alternative. Therefore, any supression of news we believe is wrong.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. LeRoy, I do not want to hurry you and I think we will adjourn now and resume at 2.30 and deal with the questions.

---The hearing adjourned until 2.30 p.m.

-

-

---Upon resuming.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we start, I forgot to arrange to get a copy of the telegram that was mentioned in the Canadian Arts Council brief, I think that was the C.A.R.T.B. telegram which the witness Mr. Parkin said he would file. We will reserve a number for that, Exhibit No. 211.

---EXHIBIT NO. 211: C.A.R.T.B. telegram.

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you see that such a telegram is duly inscribed in the record.

Now, Mr. LeRoy, we do not want to rush you and if you have anything more to deal with in your presentation I wish you would do so now.

MR. LeROY: Thank you. Before I start I might explain these dark glasses are not an affectation of those people I represent, they are necessary at the present time. I would like to run down, to repeat a few of the points that I did not cover this morning so I can place them on the record again. Item 3 of our summary that the Board of Governors should carry out its responsibilities to encourage the use of Canadian talent by private stations which appears to be called for by the Act and which we feel has not been carried out.

The government should impose equitable tariffs on foreign programme material coming into this country. This is a long and detailed problem.

The CBC should engage outstanding Canadian

performers on terms and conditions at least equal to those given non-Canadian performers. I need only say this, that we do feel that an outstanding artist in the international field deserves his reward. We do feel in many cases that artists of no particularly outstanding ability appear to have been paid at a much higher level than some outstanding Canadian to perform. It may be a matter of market conditions but we think it should be checked most thoroughly.

We have commented that we believe facilities should be improved and that a study should be made of the desirability of increasing rehearsal of programmes. All these points tie back to something we said this morning that economic pressures seem to be behind these things in that the corporation has not a sound desire to improve its conditions.

Better training and more financial encouragement should be offered in order to obtain and retain top quality producers in television. It is our belief through our contacts for a great many years with the corporation that at many levels the payment, the financial return to people is extremely low in this country as compared to the opportunities south of the border. We are faced, in analysing our broadcasting system, one with competition from across the border, the encroachment on to our cultural picture of the country and so on and this also seems to be an economic pressure that is draining away from Canada many people of outstanding ability and these could be our people,

particularly at the top level of the CBC, producers, management, chairman of the Board of Governors, that these men must be extremely idealistic because in our opinion the rewards for the tremendous job they have undertaken, the financial rewards are not very great. There are other compensational rewards which we appreciate but we do believe that the Corporation at times has suffered because of not being able to meet the price for the best men.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is sort of a built-in problem for any sort of government agency?

MR. LeROY: We believe that, yes, although we do find examples in other spheres and I might touch on a few of them. I think there is a wide divergency between the figure paid to the president of the Canadian National Railways and the head of the CBC and may I say on the same terms, I believe that this difference should not exist. The CBC is something of great importance to all of us, it is operating as a national thing in our country whereby the railroads may be doing a cover job, I could not asses this properly, but there is more than one operation and I think it is a tremendous responsibility that should carry economic rewards as well as whatever rewards may accrue.

THE CHAIRMAN: On your question of the comparison of other levels, particularly performance and production levels in the United States, is it not true that there is sort of a prestige salary level in the United States which perhaps would be

a sound idea for us not to try to duplicate?

MR. LeROY: I do not think we should emulate everything that happens south of the border and I do think there are some ridiculous fees paid for some types of service in the United States. Nevertheless, if we have to maintain what we consider is a proper national service here I think we have to recognize these competitive elements and at least not have too big a spread. I think we have retained in Canada some very top quality producers who may have had bigger financial rewards elsewhere but their rewards were close enough to bring them a satisfactory standard of living and they like our way of doing things and they remain here but there is a slight danger that we may give a substandard salary to some of these people so that even they may have the greatest desire in the world to stay here and stay in our service but economic pressure takes them elsewhere. I do not say it has to be a tremendous increase or that we must necessarily be on the level of some of the other absurd salaries paid in the United States but we certainly think there should be some improvement. We think there should be a greater encouragement given to Canadian writers. This morning I heard some reference to all the available writers but we have, I believe we have many writers here but I think many of our writers and I think our association feels this way, need to gain an understanding of the requirements particularly of this new medium of television; an ability to write in some other

field does not necessarily mean you can easily produce something for television. Therefore, we believe there should be methods of schooling, training and advising and guiding writers to give them greater encouragement. Some of them are slightly afraid to risk their positions by gambling on the unknown to some extent and I believe assurance of proper selection and guidance should be given to them in order to get a greater Canadian writer content in our programmes. We state we believe foreign content of network shows should not be more than 40 per cent and on single stations not more than 60 per cent. Those are rather arbitrary figures, we have tried to observe what is going on. We have observed this over the past two years and we have checked the content particularly on the national service in radio and television and we have found that in the national field the figures have not been too far short of these figures. We think it is desirable, it would call up a slight improvement from our viewpoint. The reason we make the difference for individual stations, we foresee that they might have a greater difficulty in producing this Canadian content as individual stations. Now by Canadian content we do not mean the disc jockey show, a man who goes into a studio and sits before a microphone and carries with him one and a half hours of American transcriptions. That is scarcely a Canadian show and yet it seems to be a viewpoint expressed by some stations in

saying how many American programmes they are doing.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would your view change if they were Canadian records?

MR. LeROY: If those are recordings produced in Canada and written by Canadians I would qualify that as Canadian whether it be live, transcribed or on film. The important thing is where did it originate? In my opinion, if we are to give encouragement to the development of talent in this country we have to watch that closely.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you leave the last one, when you say "network shows" is that applicable to television you are thinking of particularly there?

MR. LeROY: In both areas. May I say once again why I stress both there; it is always expressed in some quarters and we have been concerned about the feeling that television is something new, something that is going to surplant radio and we have always sought assurances that the development of television would not be one that would bring about a curve on some of the things that had been built up in radio. Unfortunately, in our study of these various representations that presume to tell us how many people are doing what at a particular time, and may I say we do not place too great a faith in these survey procedures because there seems to be an opportunity, and may I say I have been in the field of selling time and managing radio stations, working in private stations and I know what we do and consider as good sales technique

and it is a very simple thing to make figures tell a particular story at a particular time. This can be done with these various surveys if you wish to study it long enough to produce the best sales story, but we just hate to see the complete development of television and the dropping of the national radio service because there are many examples of how radio is a type of medium -- radio can go to smaller stations in a hurry and report very quickly on various services. It was mentioned this morning, the desirability of good music on radio. I have no doubt that television will improve in its production and in its facilities, but at the moment in a great many cases the fine quality of audio is sacrificed to the picture on television. This may improve but at the moment it is true, therefore, radio in this case can supply a far better audio than television can. Imported programmes should carry identification as to the country of origin. We consider this an important point from the point of view that a listener or a viewer should know where it is coming from. Also, if I am in business it is the general practice, there is a requirement that anything is marked as to where it is manufactured or came from.

We feel the identification should be there on the air or on the screen.

Performers should participate in programme planning conferences. This may sound like a broad and bold recommendation on our part. By this we

do not believe that we should participate and vote on the final programming of anything on any of our networks in Canada but we do believe there would be an advantage to those who are doing the programming, planning the programme in confering with the people who are in the performing field so they may have perhaps a picture of the availabilities, what is going on elsewhere. For instance, we cover several fields and we know when there are going to be a lot of performers away from Toronto, things of that sort and we think that should be done. May I say that a great many things have happened as a result of your hearings. We have noticed the corporation has quietly adjusted a number of things that seemed to be raised during the past five months. There has been an invitation that perhaps we might like to meet with them and confer with them on some of these things. I do not think it is unwise that they are tidying up shop as these hearings go on because we have evidence that private broadcasters were subject to criticism and had tried to mend their ways to a considerable extent in the past few months. We know this because we made surveys in various areas to find out what the trends are because we are interested in the same things as the people who are interested in us.

THE CHAIRMAN: If we keep on much longer we may not have to write a report.

MR. LeROY: Perhaps I am labouring this too long.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was not suggesting that.

MR. LeROY: We believe there should be an active policy of marketing Canadian programmes in other countries. We believe that one of the things that has held this back is that there has been some doubt as to the ability of the CBC to do such a thing and I think an effort should be made to clear this situation and have it spelled out as to whether you can or cannot do something. We do know that entertainment programmes, Canadian talent is not used widely in the world markets and countries with a much smaller capacity have done this successfully.

-

-

-

-

For instance, there are more Australian programmes outside the country of Australia than there are Canadian programmes outside of the country of Canada. In case there are questions in this area later. May I assure you that that is not a case of efforts and controls of the unions who govern performance. But I would be very happy to answer questions on this point. We have made the point that we feel that public relations and press and information departments of the CBC should be improved. I know that you have read our brief, sir, and have seen the arguments which are mentioned there. We think this is a very important aspect of the Corporation, not only to public relations and press and information, but the programmes and what they are putting on, and we have mentioned two things which may not be normally regarded as affecting public relations but we regard them as such. We feel a very important aspect of the public relations department will be to provide information on what we feel is a fine national system. We find that buildings, for instance, that house our Corporation are scarcely items to which any Canadian would point with pride and say, "Look, isn't that great -- that house is our Canadian Broadcasting Corporation." The buildings appear to be a number of tired warehouses and also in off-beat streets as far as Toronto is concerned, except for an old school that was once condemned and then converted

over to a building for the women's Air Force during the war, and in spite of being condemned, was then reconverted and turned into a radio building in Toronto. Then, a strangely garage-like looking structure was put on the back lot, and this houses the most important English television production centre in Canada. That is just not good public relations. Thank you, sir, that is a summary of our brief.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. deGrandpre, are you taking this?

MR. deGRANDPRE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am. Mr. LeRoy, may I refer you to page 1 of your brief under the heading of Board of Directors --

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt you, Mr. deGrandpre, but I would like to get my mind clear as to exactly what the Canadian Council of Authors and Artists represents.

MR. LeROY: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it an association as its name implies, or is it a trade union that is affiliated with other trade unions.

MR. LeROY: Thank you, sir, yes. The Canadian Council of Authors and Artists in its original concept was a professional association. We have found certain advantages in our procedures but, because of the situation existing in other countries there was an advantage in being formulated properly as a union. We are, in fact, a union, sir, started by the Canadian Labour Congress

of Canada with a national charter -- a charter giving privileges to our various trade associations. Originally when we were formulated there were a number of associations and we had a top body called the National Council. We did not have any proper authority but it was simply a meeting of our various associations across Canada and we had ties to the American Federation of Labour. Now frankly, sir, we had ties to the American Federation of Labour, but nevertheless, sir, we preferred to create our own way of life in Canada without ties to the United States and financial obligations, and so forth. We thought that all those things were better to go to our own government so we have formulated ourselves in this way. You may wonder at the representation because of these statements -- about how many artists are available and what they can do, and so on, and how you become a member of our association.

To start with, sir, you can't just apply and become a member immediately. We have a professional standard which we believe should be maintained, and therefore you must received at least six professional engagements in one year before you are eligible for membership. On other occasions you may work in collaboration with one of our members in other various commercial types of productions, and so on. This means there are about four times as many people working on that basis than those who are currently members, - Because we don't want to create a body of people just for the sake of having a great many members, when it is an association from which they find the only pressure is to pay dues and not necessarily that any work comes from all this.

So we have tried to create an organization in this way, and so they must be fully employed or to a large extent employed professionally.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well then, in the first paragraph you also have a statement that your association concerns itself with the maintenance of professional standards -- I notice this is a sort of stock clause in a good many organizations' charters but what have you done about the maintenance of high professional standards?

MR. LeROY: That sounds rather grand perhaps, sir, but to start with the first barrier before becoming a member is that you have to have six professional engagements, which means you must have a certain standard of professionalism or you are not likely to be employed six times professionally in a year. We also guard ourselves while we may set up organizations in some areas to lay down terms and conditions under which our memberships may work, in connection with the subject of behaviour or attendance and things of that sort -- professional behaviour.

THE CHAIRMAN: What I was really coming to is, do you have any disciplinary power?

MR. LeROY: Yes, we do.

THE CHAIRMAN: In so far as performance is concerned?

MR. LeROY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want you to go into cases, but is this power on occasions exercised?

MR. LeROY: It has been exercised, sir, as it probably is in other associations because to

explain, you might be interested to know as far as a trade association is concerned where there is no competition below certain minimum standards, we don't seek to negotiate or that sort of thing for our members, but we always seek to establish the minimum terms and conditions. Do you mean if a man gets drunk perhaps?

THE CHAIRMAN: I was thinking, for argument's sake say an offence is made against what is loosely described as good taste in performance; does that come up to you?

MR. LeROY: May I say no, if the CBC engages one of our performers they assume the responsibility and they are showing confidence in engaging him, but if we feel that it reflects on our association or on our membership under our constitutional by-laws he can be subject to discipline.

MR. deGRANDPRE: To complete the information that you have just given to us, you are the official bargaining agent for the radio and television performers; is that correct?

MR. LeROY: With the exception of musicians, sir.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Yes, musicians -- with that reservation which is indicated in the contract.

MR. LeROY: We have a number of contracts, some we have with the CBC, and you see, apart from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation -- this might be of interest to you, sir -- our biggest source of

engagement for artists in Canada strangely enough is not the private stations but the advertising agencies and production firms which do this. Quite often we find that private stations in some areas seem to take a great deal of credit for the engagement of talent which they did not, in fact, engage, but which is placed there by the advertising agency or the sponsor, or the private production organization. So in actual fact I would say almost 50 per cent of our income comes from this type of engagement through advertising agencies.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I take it the same would apply to the CBC performances?

MR. LeROY: I don't quite follow you, sir.

MR. deGRANDPRE: You say your members are not hired by the private stations as such because they were imposed upon the private stations by the advertising agencies?

MR. LeROY: Yes.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Or the producers -- the independent producers -- I take it that the same reasoning would apply to the CBC organization?

MR. LeROY: No, not by any means, sir. By no means. To start with the CBC in the field of radio in the past has not maintained a high amount of advertising, but in a great many cases, and this applies to television too, the CBC engages our services and then the CBC turns itself into the position of the advertiser -- so our

payment or our guaranteed income and our engagements are made with the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the evidence is that while on fairly rare occasions the CBC would purchase a production from elsewhere, that the great majority is produced by them and in those cases they do the engagements?

MR. LeROY: That is right, sir.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Coming back to this section on the Board of Governors, you say that the Act as it is today appears to encourage confusion between the functions of the Board, the first function being the regulatory body and the second being the Board of Directors of the CBC?

MR. LeROY: That is correct, sir.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Could you tell us how this atmosphere of confusion has developed. Is it the fact of the public or is it the fact of the CBC itself?

MR. LeROY: I think it is a combination of both. I think it is a combination of misleading propaganda of those people who are not happy with the CBC. I think it has been a matter of bad public relations and personal information from the Corporation, and I think on occasion press coverage, perhaps, of a statement from, say, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the CBC seems to have been presented in the press as if he were the General Manager of the CBC. There seems to be a confusion existing, and from the records of what we have read and stories we have had presented to us, and the arguments we have faced in talking to other Canadians, we find there is a definite confusion.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Can we avoid this confusion under present conditions?

MR. LeROY: Well, I believe the important thing to tidy up here is that, as we understand it, the Station Relations Department, which has to do with maintaining the good relations of those stations which are part of the network, back and forth, making these arrangements, and so on, also seem to have been in the past acting as police force for the regulatory body. In your capacity as a Station Relations person you are reporting to Management and dealing with Management level, and it appears to us when you are dealing with matters of the regulatory body and policing, you

should be reporting to the Board of Governors. We think it is one organization doing two jobs that are in conflict with each other.

MR. de GRANDPRE: I wasn't thinking in terms of actual regulation, but I was thinking in terms of the actual policy of the Board under these two aspects. For instance, when the CBC appeared before us, the Chairman of the Board presented the brief and the General Manager also answered questions, and there was an interlocking of presentation. That is why I am asking whether it can be avoided under present conditions.

MR. LeROY: Well, I am wondering whether it could be avoided. If there is teamwork and cooperation in some areas it is a very good idea. For the person at the head of the Board, who is stating policies, to have a close liaison with the General Manager can be in many cases a good thing if it is not abused and incorrectly regarded by the public and other people. I do believe a little more care should be taken at times in matters of stating policy. I believe policy should be stated by the Board of Governors or the Chairman of the Board of Governors. I think, however, areas that you might call "carrying out" that policy -- that is, management and administration - would be much better reported on more often by the General Manager rather than by the Chairman of the Board of Governors. I think at times, with his very frank attitude, it seems

to me, with the Canadian public that quite often, perhaps in Ottawa, in order not to look as if is hiding something he gives an answer where he might be better directed to let the General Manager answer it.

MR. de GRANDPRE: If you take this attitude, who would be the CBC -- I mean, the broadcasting agency, because as it stands today under the Act the CBC is formed of ten governors and a chairman.

MR. LeROY: I think it is confusing, but may I put it this way: I believe that the management of the CBC is operating a network and has a certain number of stations that are part of that network. I believe the Chairman of the Board of Governors and the members of the Board of Governors are governing all broadcasting in Canada -- CBC and private stations. This is my understanding of the way the Act is set out. They are there for the purpose of describing national policy, setting standards and giving us guidance towards bringing about a national service which seems to be desired by the public. So, in essence, this Board of Governors is not just the Board of Governors of the CBC; they are the Board of Governors of all broadcasting, and, incidentally, I may substitute "CBC" for "all broadcasting", the way this Act is written.

MR. de GRANDPRE: In the first part of the Act this seems to be the principle behind

it, but then if you go on and read Section 8, they have the right to maintain and operate broadcasting stations, and I think that is where the confusion comes in, or, in your estimation, you have two separate roles performed by the same organization.

MR. LeROY: Are you suggesting, sir, that perhaps there might be a breakdown so that they do not operate broadcasting stations?

MR. de GRANDPRE: Well, I was leading to that.

MR. LeROY: I would be very happy to give my opinion on that.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I am inviting it.

MR. LeROY: Thank you. I would say, if we have a problem with our national system and we expect them to do certain things, and we have some fears on the amount of money to bring this about, then we would be making a step in the wrong direction if we moved them completely to network operation and nothing else, because this is the unprofitable operation. Furthermore, may I say that I believe they need the facilities and stations in order to provide the programming, and I think their function is guidance and presentation of programming in Canada as well, and I further believe that there are not very many private operators in Canada who would be willing to substitute for those CBC stations that are providing the formative programming, and they

would not find it too desirable because it is not too salable from the point of view of sponsorship.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. LeRoy, on that point your evidence is very close to the evidence which was given recently in the United States by the broadcasting chains to the inquiry going on down there.

MR. LeROY: I am not familiar with it.

THE CHAIRMAN: It happens to be very much, as I read it, the same, and we are going down to the States next month to get more information about American experience. It seems to indicate -- special chain network operations are less profitable, as you say, and that even a large organization like the Columbia Broadcasting System depends very heavily upon the revenues derived from its station operations to get into the black.

MR. LeROY: I may say also from the sale of their programme material, sir, they are in the provision of film as well, which is also a source of income.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes, of course, but just to take these two branches of broadcasting, the general picture seems to be, in the American experience, so far as we have got it, that the network operations are the less profitable operation, and the station operations are the more profitable. Now, in your experience, having been exposed to this business

for some time, is there any reason why, if a private owner can, as we know they do, operate a television or radio station at a profit, why, if the networks are kept separate, can't the CBC operate the same station under the same rules at the same profit?

MR. LeROY: Well, I think that evidence has been presented to you in the last few months; it is the desire of so many Canadians for types of programme that are practically not commercial vehicles. A private station could not afford to give the type of special servicing to so many groups as is done by the CBC. This would not be a good private enterprise operation.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, but now you are talking about things which are basically network operations?

MR. LeROY: This is true.

THE CHAIRMAN: My question was, as far as station operations are concerned?

MR. LeROY: Fine, if you will let me compete; but let us take an example of the station in Toronto owned by the CBC, CJBC, which may be regarded as the lighter type of programme. It is affiliated as a basic station of the Dominion Network. I am quite familiar with it, living there. This station is operated locally, although it carries some programmes to the network. Why cannot it compete successfully with the private stations and go out and raise some sponsors?

One, because the CBC does not compete in the local field. In other words, they won't go out for spot announcements to local sponsors ---

THE CHAIRMAN: Should they?

MR. LeROY: I don't believe so, sir. We have set up a situation where there is supposed to be a partnership -- that is, private stations sharing our networks and we must remove the areas of competition if this partnership is to work happily. I believe national advertising properly should be on the network, but I don't believe any member of the Corporation should regard itself as a local community station and proceed to pull revenues from that community in competition with these private stations. If we are going to do this, then we must scrap this partnership arrangement, and the CBC will have to purchase, build or do something about putting stations right across Canada and offering the service completely independently and not in the partnership. This would be a terribly expensive undertaking.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us take the television system: they do sell local advertising on television?

MR. LeROY: This is true, but I am not sure how long this policy will maintain. May I point out, the only areas where I know this is being done is in areas where there is no private television station at the moment.

I do not know what they intend doing, but I would assume, and I would consider it proper, that if the day came when there was a private station in Toronto as well as the CBC station, that the CBC should cease to accept the local advertisements and confine themselves to national advertising as they have done in radio.

THE CHAIRMAN: The thing that is bothering me is your picture of an overall undertaking which has two more functions -- the network side and the station operations side, and as it now seems to be set up, the less profitable or even costly side is being assumed by the public system, while the profitable side is being left to the private operators. This is the fact at the moment.

-

-

-

-

MR. LeROY: That is correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: They were faced with the problem of trying to keep the overall costs down to a reasonable level for this broadcasting operation as so many people seem to want. Why then should it not take advantage of the more profitable side of the operation and conduct its station performances on a strictly commercial line so far as their being commercial?

MR. LeROY: Formerly there was far more required time from private station network operations and much more stringent regulations. Perhaps we have eased them too much. Perhaps this is creating a greater imbalance than should exist. I do not claim the private operator, or man in business for himself, should have continual pressure, nor should those pressures be removed to let him improve his profit picture. We do know these efforts are important at all times and whether the pressures can be successful or not I don't know.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the financial picture is simpler to work out because it is less complicated, in some way. If you have, for example, a national service on television which goes in effect to the A, B or C -- the CBC -- there are two systems, French and English, and also is available to 25 or 26 private stations. That is the prevailing national service across Canada. In the first place if this is the service that is needed for the purpose of supplying Canadian

content and Canadian plans in our program is there any justification for the people of Toronto getting a complete national programme service and the people of Peterborough, 90 miles away, getting only partial service because the regulations do not require them to take the whole package. In other words, what justification have we if this is not liable, as far as Peterborough is concerned what justification have we for giving the people in Toronto a better deal?

MR. LeROY: In the city of Toronto I do not think the entire package carried by the CBC station is a happy one for a network. I think the CBC under certain economic pressures does one thing -- its feature items, its main programmes,are fitted to those stations, but there is a good deal of content there that is something that is something that should be given locally and is not worthy of national network.

THE CHAIRMAN: That might well be. As I understand it the so-called national programme services which is available for network does in effect go in greater quantity to the CBC owned and operated stations on the average, than it does to the private operated television stations. My question is, if this is a national programme service, what justification is there for using public money to give more service to the citizens of Toronto than the citizens of Peterborough?

MR. LeROY: I hesitate to suggest it, sir, because there seems to be such a build-up of financial requirements, but from our point of view the ideal

situation would be if the programmes were available to both.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is a practical matter --

MR. LeROY: It is an impractical matter economically.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us assume you get down to the basic level of doing a job of a national programme production to all television stations on the network, then you are left in each case with approximately 50 or 55 per cent of the time which is not supplied by that programme. That is done locally. And the private station has to go out and fill in its time by advertising and so forth and succeeds, I think, the figures show, fairly well, in using that time to show a profit at the end of the year.

MR. LeROY: I think the economic factor offers here again, sir, but for the time being if we want to encourage the private enterprise people in setting up these stations they must have conditions that do not bind them to time, even at the sacrifice of building a national service. It is a very heavy investment and I think within the next few years this picture will alter greatly as we build up in Canada and some of the capital expenditure becomes paid for but to encourage that heavy capital investment in some areas perhaps we should not bar them from certain productive areas in order to build up a national service. I think there must be a certain amount of give and take.

THE CHAIRMAN: That may be a good argument for keeping the national programme at a level that will allow the private station to live?

MR. LeROY: Right.

THE CHAIRMAN: But if there is any justification, if you are doing that as a service, as in my example, Peterborough, for good and better service at a national cost to the citizens of Toronto.

MR. LeROY: I can sympathize with the viewpoint this might not be fair. I suppose the first sets have gone into the heavily populated areas.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us go from that one to the second point. Having established a national programme content at some level, whatever it may be, and taking into account economics and practicality and so on, you are still left with some time left over which by discretion is going to be sufficient to allow private management to make a success and make a profit. Is there any reason why a CBC-owned station with that same balance left in its programme opportunity should not also operate in such a way as to also show a profit and thereby reduce the cost of the public system?

MR. LeROY: It depends on your bookkeeping. I think the station position, the network position, unless it is interlocked, the CBC station with its personnel, and so on, is devoted to material going out to the private station or network. You cannot compare the two. The one station, the private station, is on the receiving

end and the CBC is on the giving end. It is hard to balance those figures. It cannot be done if it is tied in with those services.

THE CHAIRMAN: As you say, there is a bookkeeping problem, but I wouldn't think off hand it would be insurmountable.

MR. LeROY: Perhaps if you changed your bookkeeping methods the bookkeeping could be made to show that the CBC does make money --

THE CHAIRMAN: But they have one great advantage, that is if your system is accurate and fair and if your objective should be, when you are operating a station, that you are going to try and make money, so you are more efficient and more vigorous in your operation and more commercial, when you are commercial.

MR. LeROY: At least on a competitive basis that could do it, but as long as this condition exists that exists in radio, the remaining allocation to the local advertising field, and seeking advertising from the local community merchants, the public station will never be able to show the figures of the private station.

MR. deGRANDPRE: May I go back to the first question that I raised about an atmosphere of uneasiness that exists right now between the private stations and CBC. Would there not be a possibility of creating a policy-making board which would show the way to the broadcasters whether they be public or private and allow the CBC to be operated as an ordinary corporation with

its independent board of directors and different from the present policy-making board?

MR. LeROY: I would prefer to see the CBC maintain its present position in charge of the regulating body but as I said earlier we believe there is room for a second regulatory body and a policy-making body. This trade association represents a great majority of private stations in Canada and has set up controls that I think could be put to better purpose. I think they could set up a regulatory board and policy board and so on and if they indicated it was a serious minded body I would presume that the Board of Governors would be most interested in not only hearing from the management of the CBC on that one phase of the national CBC but also in hearing the opinions and viewpoints of what regulations have been carried out by the regulatory body or advisory body of the C.A.R.T.B. which represents many of the stations that make up that other part of the national CBC.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You think more of it as an advisory board than a regulatory board and it would operate as self-regulatory on their own convictions and as an advisor to CBC on many affairs?

MR. LeROY: Many of these affairs that arise, arise on private decisions and they wonder if they should clean their own house.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Mr. deGrandpre's first question was directed to the confusion that exists in relation to the CBC in the public mind, not only in relation to the CBC but also in relation to private

associations and you made mention, or Mr. deGrandpre did, one or the other of you, of the duties of the chairman and general manager of the CBC. Now I am just looking at the Act for a moment and the Act merely says one of the governors shall be chairman and then it says the general manager shall be the chief executive of the corporation. I won't ask you to define what the duties of the chairman should be but do you think it would assist if the Act was more specific as to the duties the chairman should carry out?

MR. LeROY: I would prefer not to comment on that but I would like to say this. That I think that covers a certain phase of, or class -- I think the Board of Governors might help to clear up the confusion if it was the Board of Governors of broadcasting instead of the Board of Governors of the CBC. If it is the Board of Governors of all broadcasting, public and private, that is its dual position.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would it fulfil a dual position as the Board of Governors of broadcasting and CBC?

MR. LeROY: I cannot recall the Act, but I believe there is a small executive body that operates within -- am I correct?

THE CHAIRMAN: To put the thing more precisely, you are suggesting the Board of Governors, or some of them, would act as directors of the CBC?

MR. LeROY: Correct.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Then that brings me back to the original statement of yours that no competition exists between CBC and the private station. If that is the case, the Board of Governors could fulfil a dual function but I can see no reason for the existence of the CBC or a private station unless they get an audience. There is no reason for their existing without an audience. Don't you feel in that realm, at least, they are competitive?

MR. LeROY: No I do not. If that is so, sir, then everything is competitive and we are all in competition with the CBC no matter what business we are in. There can be no competition with the private station as they are there to make money.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: But both are endeavouring to get an audience and without an audience neither one has a reason for existence.

MR. LeROY: I have not heard any statement that they have no audience.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: No, but if they had no audience there would be no reason for their existing. Now they are both competing for the same audience. If there is a private station and a CBC station is one town then they are competing for that audience.

MR. LeROY: They are competing for that, yes.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: So, to that extent they are in competition.

THE CHAIRMAN: What you are saying is that the word competition can have various meanings.

MR. LeROY: The CBC is in the same category as libraries which are publicly maintained. I may not use them very often but I like to know they are there.

THE CHAIRMAN: But in this role of competition there is a kind of direct competition you get from some people who are selling the same thing just as there is also a broader competition that exists between different branches of the trade. For instance travelling agencies may compete with the motor car manufacturer for the consumer's dollar.

MR. LeROY: Some of this competition I regard as rather awkward and unfortunate and goes back to another area and that is the importation of certain programmes. We set up a certain broadcast programme and hope we will build up an audience and then we create a situation where we will build up all the material we can get in order to take away the audience from the thing we are trying to create.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I think Mr. Stewart also has the thought that there is also competition for talent. You can have competition for what you sell and you can also have competition for what you acquire and in this case there is competition for talent.

MR. LeROY: There is a great deal of competition for talent and in our opinion a great deal of competition goes back to the subject

of tariffs and I am looking forward to answering any questions.

MR. deGRANDPRE: This was my next question. Do you think the creation or establishing of tariffs would work to the advantage of the people you represent?

MR. LeROY: I think it would work to the advantage of Canada, sir, not just to ourselves and may I say -- let me tell you some of the areas, if I may, where I believe it is of benefit to Canada.

I believe it is of benefit to Canada whenever new industries come up here and they are given every encouragement. We have a situation now where if I am an American company with branches here I can bring my programme into Canada, and I have already got half the cut, so to speak, through their putting it through the United States, and I bring it into Canada if I am an American firm. On the other hand, if I am a purely Canadian firm I have not the advantage of using this, I am in an unfair competitive business. They have this programme to bring into Canada and regard it as a bonus territory but as a Canadian advertiser I have to compete with an American company that can utilize those things here.

The other thing is, I believe in all areas some degree of protection is to be given. I am not suggesting that we are seeking to set up barriers to keep things out. We have certain tariffs on books coming into Canada and I have not noticed this has created any situation where American books are not read in Canada and Canadian books get wide reading, I regret to say the other is true. The same applies if I bring in engravings or plans. I must say the architects have a whale of a good deal and I do not hope for anything like that, I think they have a darned good thing.

I think foreign talent should come in here on the network jobs but they should be brought in on what is, to some extent, a fair degree of competition. The larger build-up of names south of the border, enhancing the name publicly and giving it some value -- we have not been able to do this in Canada and yet we can bring some of those ballyhoo names here and they are here, in many cases, with less talent than our Canadian performers. It is unfair. Let us see how it works in the other direction; if our material goes there there is an assessment of value on the programme. On the other hand, on that transcription of American shows coming to Canada, there is only a charge on the value of the transcription, with no assessment whatever of the value of the programme content. We do not think this is good, and, furthermore, one of the things the CBC is suffering from in this country and our national system as well as the artists and various organizations that have appeared before you encouraging a greater emphasis on Canadianism -- they are suffering from many "freeloaders" who are having a grand time with this programme material that is being brought into Canada and placed on the private stations. It is popular, it has a good built-up name, and so on, and we are not only bringing it in cheaply, making a great deal of money on it, but we are creating certain situations where there is

not much employment of Canadian talent. I think this is a regrettable situation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is not your book example, from your point of view, an unfortunate one? You say there is a tariff on books that has not succeeded in doing much for the Canadian artists but it does succeed in raising the cost of ---

MR. LeROY: There is a difference, I think we will be more successful in handling our situation than the Canadian booksellers; I have a certain confidence.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may be hoping for a higher tariff.

MR. LeROY: There is another aspect which was not mentioned before; I do not think it is a sin at all that the tariff may provide funds for the Government. We are sitting here declaring that all sorts of money is needed, but we would like to give some thought to where this money is coming from, and I believe we use a phrase here regarding tariffs, on page 4, where we say:

> "We believe that adequate tariffs would not only correct a manifest iniquity that exists in the distribution and production of programmes but in a manner morally and poetically, just contribute to the vitality and security of our national broadcasting system."

In other words, this money will indirectly

come back to nurture our own broadcasting system, we hope.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But do you not feel that this will make the exporting of programmes more difficult because if you start setting up tariff barriers in Canada it is not unlikely that you will have the same kind of tariff barriers ---

MR. LeROY: We will not have made an unfriendly gesture, the tariffs are at the other end; they are not at this end.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let us take the American system; is there a tariff on Canadian programmes into the States?

MR. LeROY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: On what value?

MR. LeROY: There is a valuation placed on the programme content as well as valuation on the actual disc or whatever it may be. That is authorized, and I cannot give you the detailed figures but I would suggest they would be of great interest to study.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: What about a live programme going over there? I mean to say, after all a live programme coming into Canada originating in CBS is importation into Canada. Is there any tariff on that, do you know?

MR. LeROY: No, sir. I would suggest that there be certain considerations in the establishing of the tariffs. I do not

think there should be an all-encompassing tariff on everything. I particularly think tariffs should bear most heavily on that that is imported for commercial gain; that is, that is brought in on behalf of the sponsorship or a commercial set-up.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Even brought in live?

MR. LeROY: Yes, but in bringing in what we consider to be the better programmes from other countries, to give us a better understanding of other countries, if this is brought in as part of our national service, without commercial gain, I would suggest that the tariff be waived or greatly reduced.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Other than commercial gain, you have in mind, presumably, a non-sponsored programme?

MR. LeROY: Correct.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you think that tariffs should be set up only against the American importations or against all importations?

MR. LeROY: Against all importations for every country in the world.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Including the Commonwealth countries?

MR. LeROY: There may be certain preferred, and in this particular area I am personally talking off the cuff and I might get my ears cuffed later for some of these statements.

I was given a particular formula that was discussed at some length, but may I say you gentlement are a great deal more probing than some of our membership, and, therefore, we have not got all the answers.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: You can always defend yourself on the basis that we are most persuasive.

MR. deGRANDPRE: At the top of page 5, you say:

> "The CBC gives evidence of a definite lack of appreciation of the potential 'star' status of Canadian performers. Unknown American performers not only are given higher fees but in most cases receive a better billing than Canadian performers."

MR. LeROY: That is correct, in my opinion, although I think there is an improvement in this direction. I think, as I mentioned earlier -- I do not know how information gets around in such a hurry but already from what has been presented before this Commission plus what people presume is going to be presented, people seem to be doing a certain amount of tidying up. We are happy to note that the plans for the fall show a great improvement in this direction. We do feel that in the past, if there is an entertainer from elsewhere, that the press and other

announcers always seem to raise a great fanfare about artists from somewhere else. We have some here not only equal but in some cases of better calibre, and certainly merit great attention, and we do not believe they are getting this. We have watched, and naturally we have a wide membership, the various announcements, the various promotionals and we have read their publications and this is our opinion, based on that check-up.

We also, of course, are aware of the fees paid in some cases, and while I do not wish to name individuals and what they get, it would be most improper, but nevertheless we have got them.

MR. deGRANDPRE: You have indicated there is quite a wide field for the film industry and that the Canadian film industry should develop with the help of the CBC in order to present more Canadian productions?

MR. LeROY: Not just with the help of the CBC; I think at this point the shoe is on the other foot. I think right now the CBC needs help. We are trying to arrive at what their responsibilities are going to be, and if the national operation of television is to be their responsibility, that is, providing a national service, I say that we believe the CBC must be given the fullest sort of authority to encourage development or even go into the film business in order to provide the fullest sort of service on television, because film

and television are interlocking to a great extent.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you not feel if the CBC goes into the film business there will be a duplication by the National Film Board?

MR. LeROY: No, I do not think they should go fully into the film business, and remember we are speaking specifically in this relationship for films for use in television. In some cases you may say it is uneconomical to produce a thing specifically for rent, but believe me, the day has arrived where this is the most profitable thing. I do not say they should become an organization and produce the films; they are no more capable of doing that than the National Film Board, and the National Film Board could not even come close to producing the film requirements for a full national service. We must give encouragement to whoever goes into this business of film production. We must survey the facilities and it would not be right for the Corporation to develop facilities for film if it is not necessary, if there are other facilities available. I think the CBC should have the fullest authority to investigate the situation and seek to help in this area.

MR. de GRANDPRE: You think in the past there has been the greatest cooperation between the CBC and the National Film Board?

MR. LeROY: I would not want to comment about it; I have heard different opinions.

I know the CBC has used materials of the National Film Board, and in many cases the CBC have commissioned the National Film Board to do a great many things for them for television specifically.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you think there are at the present commercial sources for film production?

MR. LeROY: I believe there are sources but I think our facilities need improvement and I believe we need to develop more trained technical personnel here, but, I believe, a start must be made in this direction and I think the widest possible publicity should be given to what available facilities there are so that Canadian companies or perhaps even some firms in other countries may become interested in the opportunities for this sort of work in Canada. If we want to get a Canadian reflection on our network, and this seems to be the desire of a great many Canadians, a good deal of film has to be used. This I believes follows logically.

MR. deGRANDPRE: In the same sphere, it has been indicated to us by some people who presented briefs that CBC should have television productions prepared by advertising agencies or other groups; as it is today we have been told that the CBC insists that all productions should emanate from the CBC studios?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think, Mr. de Grandpre, that is not quite the way you would phrase the

question. I think we have been told that so far as productions are made in CBC studios then the CBC insists that they shall have charge of the production, and I do not think we have been told that the CBC won't take or buy appropriate television productions produced elsewhere.

MR. LeROY: This is correct. If I could produce a satisfactory production in my own studios of sufficiently good standard, and a suitable time spot is available there is no reason why the Corporation will not carry it, but they insist upon control of production in their own studio.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I am sorry if I misstated the facts, but do you think CBC should try to obtain more productions made outside, or do you feel that their attitude at present is the correct one? I understand that they have not relied heavily on outside productions?

MR. LeROY: I think they would welcome outside productions of a good standard. They are so pressed in their facilities right now, and we find they are even pressed to the extent of purchasing a great many foreign productions. I think they would welcome an opportunity of purchasing a high class Canadian production to avoid the criticism that they are not heavily enough Canadian in their content. I see no reason why they would not proceed to take advantage of every opportunity to purchase or utilize a good Canadian production.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are really saying there that it is not the CBC which is preventing the private enterprise, but that there is a lack of private enterprise in this field?

MR. LeROY: It seems to be so, sir, as far as Canada is concerned. The enterprise seems to be south of the border, and the Canadian enterprise

seems to be a matter of taking a fast trip to Chicago or Hollywood or New York and purchasing several tapes and films and rushing back here to sell them.

MR. deGRANDPRE: You also indicate at page 5 of your brief that the CBC -- you recommend that a well organized training plan should be established by the CBC.

MR. LeROY: Again may I say that I think great pressures and the economic factor have probably held up some of these very desirable moves that I think should be taken. I believe certain efforts have been made. Again, I don't like to relate everything to -- well, I think there is no harm in crediting this Commission by its very sitting bringing about some results. Certainly this summer I think efforts were made in that direction.

THE CHAIRMAN: You may be giving us an assumption of what is going to happen, anyway.

MR. LeROY: If it does happen, Mr. Chairman, you will get the credit for it.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Do you really think that this is the role of the CBC, to train people to act as producers or script writers?

MR. LeROY: I not only think it is proper; I think it is their responsibility to seek to present to Canadians a reflection of every aspect of Canadian production which may be developed here in trying to use a certain amount of discrimination and taste to produce the best. Whether it is produced in their studios or an outside studio, if it is a Canadian item produced in Canada, I believe they

have a responsibility to do that. I would hate to see the day when we are confined purely to what has been done by the staff of the CBC producers without recognition of any other production. I think they should go a step further. I think where private stations develop programmes of sufficient merit, they should encourage this and should encourage the widest distribution of it on our national system.

THE CHAIRMAN: There has been some of that.

MR. LeROY: Yes, some of it has been done. There has been encouragement given. There is one other aspect, and I sort of drag this in by the heels; there is another form of approach which can be done internally, and I think carries a lot of merit. We have not thought there was merit to the present system whereby the CBC sell a programme but, in effect, you get the impression that they are subsidizing the cost of that programme and selling it to a sponsor. In other words, the sponsor is not paying the full production cost on that programme, and selling it to a sponsor. In other words, the sponsor is not paying the full production cost on that programme. We are all aware of this. We believe there is a different approach which requires the cooperation of the private stations and the CBC, and I believe that is the nature of our broadcasting system; one of cooperation and not competition. I believe what should be done is this: that there should be a re-assessment of rates on television as far as time is concerned --

the sale of time. I believe that the sponsor of a Canadian production should be given a discount on time rates on network or individual stations. This in essence would mean that large American advertisers or Canadian advertisers bringing in a foreign programme, would place it on our network and he would pay full time cost; however, a person who either by creating or backing the Canadian production and presenting it on our networks would receive a discount on the tariff.

MR. deGRANDPRE: Do you prefer this suggestion to the present policy followed by CBC that whenever a sponsor brings in an American programme he should also put on a Canadian programme?

MR. LeROY: Yes, I consider that not too good. I might commend the CBC for doing it. I think they have been doing their best, but sort of working off the cuff in this area. I don't think this is necessarily a good thing, because I may want to come in; I may not be able to buy both, or have to settle for a lower standard. I don't think anything which makes for a deal concerning standards is too good.

MR. deGRANDPRE: On programme content you indicate a certain formula at page 6 of your brief by which the programme content of network shows should not be comprised of more than 40 per cent foreign programme content, and, (b) single-station programming should not be comprised of more than 60 foreign programme content. I would

like to put to you the objection which has been made to us that if you accept a very rigid formula which may be considered as good broadcasting in a certain area could be, in fact, very poor broadcasting in another, and that more discretion should be left to the broadcaster and to the body who would have to construe the regulations.

MR. LeROY: I quite agree with that. Particularly in this area I do not think there should be rigid rules. I believe they should be set forth as the ideal and we should seek to come close to it. There will have to be certain adjustments in it pertaining to the particular areas when we are referring to individual stations, certainly, but I think we have to establish something as being sort of a desirable standard, but I would not quarrel if it slipped a little bit one way or another. I think we must try and indicate some desirable standard.

MR. deGRANDPRE: I take it -- and I am just thinking out loud -- it could be possible to divide certain areas into area A, B or C, and set up some scales?

MR. LeROY: Quite possible.

MR. deGRANDPRE: You also point out that we should try to get away from too much centralization of programmes and it has been indicated to us that it is practically an unavoidable effect --

MR. LeROY: It will always happen.

MR. deGRANDPRE: And it will always happen, and that the role of the private broadcasters should

be in the --

MR. LeROY: I don't think the CBC, either, should give up on everything. I think this is an absolutely natural trend. Talent, like everything else, will move to larger centres, and, economically, it seems to be rather sound, and we are going to have to make certain sacrifices in some areas in order to take care of the economics of other areas, but I do believe we must continue to seek as much as possible to bring ourselves regional programming and develop the regions. Also, why should Canadians in one area of Canada not have an opportunity to develop and express themselves when those in other areas have that opportunity?

It need not be of the same type of thing. I think one of the nice things about this country of ours is that we have maintained certain regional distinctions and patterns, and ways of doing things. One area of the country may give us the best example of one field of endeavour, and another part give us a different thing. We can't always bring these to Toronto or to Montreal. We have to go out and seek them, and I don't think we are reflecting them all to the best extent.

MR. deGRANDPRE: You also suggest that news, opinion and forum programmes should not be sponsored.

MR. LeROY: On the network.

MR. deGRANDPRE: On the network. Is this an objection in principle, or do you have any facts indicating that a programme will be slanted if it is sponsored?

MR. LeROY: Say in the operation of the CBC, I think they would very rigidly seek to not have it influenced, but I think we place them in a very difficult position. On the one hand we tell them to encourage advertising, and on the other hand we say we would like to have them, but you can't say this and that and so on. It is a difficult situation, and I believe there are enough other types of programmes that are available to carry commercial sponsorship, and so on, so let us leave these things alone. Let us not cast a doubt on them.

I know that certain people cast doubt about the CBC being under the government's influence - or under the influence of a political party, and of course we would all regret interference of any sort, dealing with the expression of private opinions and views and so on. I think most right-thinking Canadians will agree that while sometimes the CBC presentations do appear a little colourless, nevertheless they are not slanted or biased. They are a very good and factual presentation of the news.

We know the CBC has in fact had news stories which are pretty derrogatory concerning the CBC itself -- this is a lot more than a private organization would do on their own, I am quite sure, and that would be one example.

MR. COMMISSIONER STEWART : Well the news is not opinion - we are dealing in facts.

MR. LE ROY : That is correct sir but I am dropping the story, in effect.

MR. COMMISSIONER STEWART : Would you still have some objection as far as a spot advertisement -- one of the beginning and one at the end of the news? ---

MR. LE ROY : No.

MR. COMMISSIONER STEWART: To get over the possibility of slanting, if there were two different spots - we will say one from a clothing manufacturer and one from a cement company?

MR. LE ROY : Well from one point of view I might regret this sort of thing on my network, but if it was necessary to maintain

the sort of service I wanted in this country that this revenue was required, providing they weren't permitted the sponsorship of the programme but were merely permitted to place their commercial message beside it, then I will swallow it if it is necessary. I think that this might well be taken as the entire attitude concerning TV programmes, sir, that the sponsors are not permitted to buy the programmes, but that they are actually being given the privilege of placing messages beside these programmes, and that there should be no interference in the content as long as the present policy of the CBC having full supervision of these programmes is continued.

MR. COMMISSIONER STEWART : I was thinking from the point of view that you do say that it might be thought by the public that the sponsor was influencing the programme, probably by having things to meet it rather than by slanting what is given.

MR. LE ROY : Yes.

MR. COMMISSIONER STEWART : And actually we are concerned in this commission with the finances of the CBC. Could we get over that by spot announcements at the beginning and the end, by two different concerns, if necessary, widely apart in the products they are selling?

MR. LE ROY : It could be done providing it was already given to national advertising - otherwise I do not think that they should compete with local advertisers. With private stations it could be done sir, but I do not think it is the most palatable thing in the world.

However, if it is needed,all right - as long as it is kept under control.

MR. deGRANDPRE : There was another question I wished to ask, Mr. Le Roy ---

MR. LE ROY : May I just interject very briefly here? A lot of the comments we have made have been rather broad; and I may men-tion that we feel there is a very different picture between the English and the French-speaking programmes, particularly where you perhaps cast some aspersions on the enterprise of some private networks in actively producing programmes or encouraging talent.

We find this picture is very different in French-speaking Canada. Perhaps they are fortunate in a way because they have not got the competition, - it comes from south of the border to a great extent. However, all in all, there seems to be a greater sense of responsibility in the French-speaking portion, to provide a high standard of programming.

Mr. Louis Belanger who is with me, and he can perhaps answer the questions which are of a very general nature, better than I can, - and perhaps I am giving a wrong impression when I am answering primarily for the English. He can give a slightly different answer for the French language.

THE CHAIRMAN : Well , as I said at the beginning, I had hoped that Mr. Belanger would amplify or dissent from any views that you might express, if he felt this necessary. Mr. de Grandpre - did you say you had one other

question?

MR. deGRANDPRE : Yes I have Mr. Chairman. This is about the contracts and agreements now existing between the CBC and the Canadian Council of Artists and Authors, in sound and television broadcasting. I take it that as the agreements are now drafted, if a programme is re-broadcast in Canada -----

MR. LE ROY : Is this radio or television?

MR. deGRANDPRE : In either. The condition that I wanted to outline is, I think, identical in both, that if a programme is re-broadcast in Canada there are certain fixed charges. For instance, in TV there is a 65 per cent part of the fees paid ---

MR.LE ROY: For second broadcasts.

MR. deGRANDPRE : For second broadcasts.

MR. LE ROY : That they reduce as it goes on.

MR. deGRANDPRE : That they reduce as it goes on. Now, would your association have any objections to re-broadcasts abroad when your artists receive nothing for the cost - I don't think this is covered.

MR. LE ROY : We have now provided that sir - quite recently, and, as a matter of fact, as a result of it we have one programme listed for the presentation in England of the programme "Flight into Danger" - a television programme. If they elect within 90 days for payment of 10 per cent of the original fee, they

can distribute it all over the wide world, but if they do not elect within 90 days at a later point it is 15 per cent.

THE CHAIRMAN : I didn't think that the influence of the commission had gone as far as that.

MR. LE ROY : May I say this, in line with my emphasis on the desirability of sending our programmes and materials to other countries, these conditions are extremely generous. We do want to get protection within our own country but we do not find that other countries give too much protection to us.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the point was made to us last April or May that one of the impediments in the way of doing something that is distinctly Canadian, is that we have a small country and we have to seek to expand this market by exporting.

MR. LE ROY : Well the 10 per cent is not a bar.

THE CHAIRMAN : We have heard it said and I think that this is true, until very recently was it not, that at one time there was almost a prohibition against the export of such material by reason of taxation.

MR. LE ROY : There was no agreement originally - but we had imposed a much higher figure.

THE CHAIRMAN : So it is now down to the 10 per cent level, as an extra payment of cost of export--- is that export to any country ?

MR. LE ROY : To any country sir and all countries.

THE CHAIRMAN : I see.

MR. LE ROY : That 10 per cent will take in all the rest of the world. The one area we were most concerned with was the area of commercial materials. The CBC up to that time, I believe, to some extent were not too sure about their position in the manner of disseminating and sending out materials and marketing things, as to whether they were moving into a phase of the business that they were not permitted to enter. So therefore there were some doubts in this area.

THE CHAIRMAN : Well, that just leads to another question and I certainly don't want to get into the details of labour agreements here, except insofar as they influence our study of this question. However, we have had it put to us that there is a problem of very high expense in good programmes - a good type of programming - and I have cited a dozen times I suppose the case of the Macbeth production which was an hour-long production and was a quite remarkable job, and was, as far as I know, a one-shot performance.

The question I am really concerned with is this - a programme of that sort which costs maybe $30,000, is not normally justifiable over an hour unless you can get more than an hour out of it, and therefore, it is going to be done rather warily. Is there anything to be said for the imposition of something on a less high level than this 65 per cent charge for a re-run, if for not all, for certain types of production.

MR. LE ROY : Well we must admit . that there must be a degree of protection, so to speak, of our own material and to start with, the cost of these productions is really rather amazing in Canada. This same production below the border would have cost two to four times as much so, the original payment was not excessively high, if you break it down into individual artists. Consequently we have provided long-term conditions, particularly for programmes of special import such as cultural programmes or programmes of national importance.

Where we put some restrictions on purely entertainment lines in this area, we don't think this is a great deal -- this 65 per cent, but it drops again and it drops again. If the original CBC facilities are insufficiently good and the equipment is insufficiently good -perhaps a slightly better standard of reproduction might have been achieved and this product would have been extremely salable in other markets of the world, which is what you are inferring to some extent. However, we have a pretty small country and a pretty small audience and this is pretty big money, I quite agree with you.

Therefore I think that we must, whenever we enter into something rather expensive, approach it,not from the point of view of losing it and saying "this is an impossibility" but,"just in what way can we help to recover some of the costs of this thing."

THE CHAIRMAN : I think actually Mr. Le Roy my question was based on the most practical form of self-interest for the artists themselves. Is it not possible for this kind of thing that I mentioned, such as the Macbeth production, when the artists will get a mere employment fee, that bigger productions can be undertaken more often and there will need to be a lower rate of re-play - repeat charges. In other words, you could do it better on the 30 per cent than you could on the higher figure.

MR. LE ROY : But speaking so far as a monetary return is concerned, that would not be true. As far as a feeling of artistic achievement and satisfaction is concerned, it may be true, but I feel that it is better for an artist to work in some small productions for a short length of time than to tie himself up for a long time with some production which may be more grand and more spectacular.

THE CHAIRMAN : But is it not better to have a monetary return for instance the suggested 30 per cent, than no production at all - because the economics are wrong?

MR. LE ROY : We don't say that they should not be produced at all --- we say that consideration should be given to reserved these things so that they can be used again, and sent elsewhere and so on.

There are various approaches to this question

-but I am afraid I am going to get into the sphere of sitting across the table again.

THE CHAIRMAN : Oh no - no. The whole point was just raising the question as to whether or not there would be more actual Canadian production if, in view of the high cost for television, it was possible to distribute those costs over two or three performances, rather than over one, which you may have achieved at 30 per cent or 15 per cent extra charge. Whereas you would get nothing at all if it was 65 per cent.

MR. LE ROY : Well, there is already a sacrifice sir, if it appears on the air a second time. It is still using up a lot of time that might well be devoted to a new production at 100 per cent, so why should we be happy about 65 per cent, or even something less?

THE CHAIRMAN : Well it might be an American programme, you know.

MR. LE ROY : Yes, that is true. We quite agree that there is that possibility but again, we feel that the Canadian people and the corporation want to present a certain amount of programming that is not just canned American films.

THE CHAIRMAN : I think all my question amounts to is this -- whether your association had been prepared to discuss such a point ?

MR. LE ROY : It certainly has. May I say that our relationship with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and with the advertising agencies and so on is most cordial. We do not exactly have desk-thumping or arbitrations and that type of thing - - it is most friendly and may I say, we seek at all times to reduce the cost of production.

MR. COMMISSIONER STEWART : I have two questions that relate to one another. When you were summarizing this morning, you mentioned the fact that a violation of the regulations or non-observance of the regulations left the CBC with two choices --- one was to say to the offender "Be a good boy" and the other was a rather harsh penalty of taking away his license. At the same time we have heard a great deal about the breaking of the license, and the fact that the CBC does not insist on the regulations being maintained.

Now do you feel that because of the harshness of the penalty imposed it has brought about a certain timidity on the part of the CBC to insist on the regulations being maintained?

MR. LE ROY : I think that is partly so sir - without doubt.

MR. COMMISSIONER STEWART : My other question is with reference to section 8 on page 7 of your brief, where you mention that the CBC is always on the defensive. Do you think that that again, is the outcome of their function as a regulator, and as a regulator that they are afraid of public criticism.

MR. LE ROY : If you divide it as I

suggested earlier, there might be a possibility of a distinction between the board of governors on broadcasting, rather than the CBC. The CBC is really two things. It is physically a broadcasting system and a network and production studios and so on --- under management. The CBC is also apparently all the broadcasting in Canada.

Now if this was clarified, I think it might help. I think that where I say they are super-sensitive and rather timid at times, and we have had emphasis on this in some of the briefs presented to you, many people feel that perhaps multiple ownership of the newspapers and TV outlets and radio stations and so on is not desirable - and this sort of thing is perhaps one of the areas that needs consideration, because even in particular cities through a network, newspaper ownership also, station ownership in some cases also, means that they can present an editorial viewpoint which is adverse to the entire operation of the CBC.

This is a little rough and this does happen.

THE CHAIRMAN: If I may, Mr. Stewart, on that same point, Mr. Stewart is suggesting to you the possibility that the regulatory functions may have pushed over into this area of what you might call public relations; is there not also a problem of a publicly-owned corporation really arguing for policy, is this not a transposition of the rule about civil servants who must not speak about policy but leave it to the elected representatives of the people to do it. What my real question is, do you think it is possible for this type of public corporation to articulate its policy, to defend its policy and even fight for its policy?

MR. LeROY: I certainly do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for a most interesting discussion. We will proceed on with the next brief which is that of the Dominion Drama Festival. Perhaps we should have a short break at this time.

---A short recess.

-

-

-

DOMINION DRAMA FESTIVAL

Appearances:

D.J. Ongley, Q.C.

Lt.-Col. Holt

- - - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: The next brief is that of the Dominion Drama Festival to be presented by Mr. Ongley and Mr. Macdonald. We will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit 212.

---EXHIBIT NO. 212: Brief submitted by Dominion Drama Festival.

MR. ONGLEY: May I first of all say that it is not Mr. Macdonald with me, it is Lt.-Col. Holt. Mr. Macdonald is away on a western trip.

Mr. Chairman, as you see the brief of the Dominion Drama Festival is quite a short one, just a little over four pages in length and you will also note you can accuse us of being selfish, if you wish, in that we are dealing only in our brief with the role of radio and television in Canada as it applies to theatre and have not stressed the matters of management, finances and so on. We make no apology if it appears we are selfish because being interested in the development of theatre in Canada and being before you, particularly as it applies in broadcasting, it is our humble opinion

that everything in the development of the theatre would help broadcasting and, similarly, anything that can be done in the broadcasting tends to help the theatre. The theatre is going to come back to the Canadian audience whether it be in the theatre itself or in front of the television screen or listening to the radio. Actually we have made six specific recommendations of which I am afraid perhaps the brief may be leading you a little astray. We point out quite frankly that where we are recommending new policies or services we have no figures as to cost but believe the cost would not be onerous in relation to the improvements we believe would be achieved. That would not apply to the recommendation contained in paragraph (7)(d). However, in stating we have no figures we have tried, in particularly the other five items, to be somewhat realistic in our approach from the viewpoint that we don't concern ourselves as such on establishing cost alone although from the terms of reference of the Commission I think five points deal with finances. We felt that it was one thing when we suggested that it was something that might cost $5,000 but it was an entirely different thing if we suggested something that might cost $5 million and we think with the possible exception of 7 (d) we are in the reasonable class. Now, it may be summarized by going to page 3, clause 5(a) in which we ask for a review of tariffs for scripts used in television and sound broadcasting with a view to encouraging native talent. Secondly we

recommend that the CBC provide advice on a broad regional basis in script writing for radio and television and thereby demonstrate the requirements of the CBC in this field. Then we go further to 7(a) and in there we recommend that the CBC provide auditions on a regular basis conducted by qualified persons in the recognized CBC production centres in the British Columbia, prairies and Maritime regions as well as in such other cities where established drama talent is evidenced. I might say in that particular case there are audition departments in Toronto and Montreal but there is no audition department in the other CBC production centres. This is an almost impossible situation and we believe that some regular basis should be established, the result in findings to be furnished to all CBC-producing centres. I might say that in dealing with these recommendations under clause 7 that we recognize the natural gravitation to Toronto and Montreal. We do feel, however, that there should be production on a more regional basis. I would point out that we have particular knowledge of the increased interest in Canadians right across Canada outside of these two centres in theatre and it is Canadians, both the actors as well as the audience. Then, again to develop the thought of productions being on a more regional basis we go on to 7(b) and we recommend there that the CBC canvass nationally the active producers of live drama and invite them on a short-term contract basis

or such other method as may be advisable so that these producers will have the advantage of observing and learning first hand the requirements of the CBC in sound television broadcasting. We recognize, of course, the requirements for broadcasting are different from the requirements for live theatre on stage to an audience in a theatre. We further recommend that the CBC to assist all regional centres by periodically assigning senior members of its central production staffs to these centres to maintain national programme level. In other words, what we are saying there; in producing in other regions we recognize that the CBC must have productions which can command a national programme level, otherwise the CBC is not doing its task.

Then, in (d), sir, is the one item which I mentioned which could cost in excess of, perhaps, modest requirements; this is limited to the field of television, and we ask the CBC to investigate the possibility, and, as you will note, the practicability of commissioning private stations where no CBC outlet exists for the productions of programmes of a standard acceptable for national service, thus giving greater opportunities to Canadian talent throughout the regions. The Dominion Drama Festival recognizes that such a policy may require CBC assistance as follows:

(1) Trained technical production staff.

(2) Ways and means of handling the mechanics of film repairing, processing, etc., pending the establishment of complete national microwave connection, or other television network tranmission methods.

We recognize, sir, the process of kinescope is a very expensive one, and that is why we want an investigation to be made as to the practicability of that point of view. I don't think we are suggesting anything completely brand new, as I believe there was one experiment in this field by CBC in a programme originating in London, Ontario, making use of talent in that city. As to its success or failure, I don't know. Then you have the precedent that this, as I am reliably informed, was done in the early days of radio broadcasting before you had the wide coverage of the CBC across

the country.

THE CHAIRMAN: On that last point, Mr. Ongley, do you envisage this as something that may not be a straight commissioning of the private stations which does involve a payment of all costs, but that this conceivably could be a sort of partnership -- an ad hoc partnership venture?

MR. ONGLEY: Ad hoc partnership basis, exactly, sir. We do not want to set down any rigid form, because they may vary; you may have a station which has a very good production staff and another one which has not.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was thinking really of the costs.

MR. ONGLEY: That is right.

THE CHAIRMAN: The way this is phrased in your brief it looks as though you are thinking of the CBC bearing the costs entirely, but it occurs to me if the private stations wanted to develop either on radio or on television some local Canadian productions, then perhaps a partnership with the CBC on such a development would be justified?

MR. ONGLEY: That is right, sir. I must refer, perhaps, to paragraph 4, where I refer to the Aird Commission. I know the Canadian Broadcasting Act itself does not state it, and I don't know of any Act which starts off with a preamble stating the purpose of the Act. You have to read into the Act through Hansard and Commission reports, etc., what is the policy;

and the policy amongst the other policies referred to in the Aird Commission was that the national company it proposed at that time, which has now become the CBC, should be to produce programmes of a high standard from Canadian sources, and I think "Canadian sources" means Canadian, and not just one particular part of Canada. If we are going to do that, the CBC has been following that policy, and we are much in favour of it, and it again goes back to the Aird Commission which was again referred to in the Massey Commission, and so on, of fostering a national spirit, as the Aird Commission said, in interpreting national citizenship, and that is a very important thing. We in the Dominion Drama Festival particularly realize what that means, because as a bilingual organization we have been the means, through our regional festivals and through our final festivals, in bringing, for instance, French-Canadian theatre to places like Victoria, Regina, Hamilton, Saint John, Toronto, and so on, and so similarly this year we had an opportunity -- not that it was needed as much, I may say, as we all realize -- of bringing English-speaking theatre from the far west into the Province of Quebec. One has only to see in our own personal experiences of groups that have brought theatre from a French-speaking theatre both in the traditional as well as in the modern. This year Dube, who has been doing a great

deal of work in the French broadcasting in Montreal, got his start and a great deal of encouragement from theDominion Drama Festival in a one-act play which was Le Cote de Mer; at Stratford this year people were frankly privileged to see the work of Theatre de Nouveau Monde when the did the Moliete farces That is the type of thing in envisaging what has been behind the establishment of the CBC of getting the programmes across the country; let us see what the other part of the country is doing. It is the talent. There is the gravitation, and I don't think we get away from it, as Mr. LeRoy said, but there is still talent there untapped.

THE CHAIRMAN: I may say, you frankly stated this was a narrow point, and I suspect our questions will be the same.

MR. de GRANDPRE: When you suggest a review of tariffs for scripts used in television and sound broadcasting, I take it that you had in mind a revision of the tariffs set out in the contract between the CBC and Societe de l' Art, and the other contracts of a similar nature?

MR. ONGLEY: I don't know the exact tariffs as they are laid out there. I couldn't give you the figures exactly, but I have had enough comments, or we in the organization have had enough comment, brought to us of the variations that even presently exist, and secondly -- and I frankly admit it is no true

answer, that you receive so much more for a script from NBC or CBS than you do from the CBC, and you asked that question this morning, I think, of Mr. LeRoy, and said obviously things are higher in the United States, and Mr. LeRoy's answer I am in complete agreement with, and that is that we in the Dominion Drama Festival do not say you should buy a tape by any means, but on the other hand you must recognize that there still is that competitive element between two countries so close to each other where we in Canada are exposed to the American radio and television, and making it so easy for Canadian talent to sell scripts to that country. It is not the same as selling it to, say, Australia.

MR. de GRANDPRE: But isn't it a very similar situation as far as fees are concerned in the performance field, that you have the same discrepancy between the rates paid on the American networks and the rates paid on the Canadian network? It is just a matter of economics.

MR. ONGLEY: True. There is undoubtedly a great emphasis carried into the broadcasting field as well as in the theatre on the system. We haven't fully adopted that in this country.

MR. de GRANDPRE: Do you have any information as to the discrepancy between the fees paid on the American networks and the Canadian

networks, just as a guide?

MR. ONGLEY: No, I haven't, not at my fingertips, but I think it is well recognized that there is a considerable difference. I don't think we need to meet it by any means. We have enough to make the challenge more interesting to our Canadian talent. I may say, sir, that on that field the CBC, as again Mr. LeRoy mentioned, has been reviewing that this summer and is carrying on. I don't think there has been a complete review for some time. Not only that, in reading the report of the CBC I admit there were some percentages, rather than exact numbers. There has been a continual increase in the use of Canadian playwrights both for writing original plays and for adaptations, and a very healthy sign -- I think it is a healthy sign for two reasons; I don't think it is a healthy sign from the point of view of CBC, but from the point of view of development of Canadian talent. The expression has been used "upsurge". Again, if I may, I refer to the Dominion Drama Festival; we are not limited to amateur or professional, and with our preliminary groups entering into regional festivals it would involve something like three hundred across Canada. You have sort of preliminary adjudications. At our regional festivals this year the adjudicator, travelling from Newfoundland right across the country -- bilingual, naturally -- saw sixty-five

full plays, and of those sixty-five twenty-three were original Canadian plays, of which twelve were English and eleven French. It is a little reversed this year, because generally speaking we have had far more original French plays than we have had English. That again is the absorbing of talent.

THE CHAIRMAN: I just have one question to ask you which applies to a number of points throughout your submission. You suggest, for instance, in 5(b), the CBC should provide advice on a broad regional basis in script writing, and then at page 4 you talk about the CBC conducting auditions on a regular basis. . .

MR. ONGLEY: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: . . . in production centres, outside the central provinces to dig up drama talent, so to speak, and then, (b) to canvass nationally, active producers of live drama on a contract basis to go in and learn something about production, and so on. Isn't there a danger here that you are trying to place on the CBC a responsibility that is perhaps outside its normal activities, outside its legitimate sort of purposes, and doesn't a person who has drama talent, whether it happens to be script writing or production, or whatever it may be, doesn't he have to get his eggs to market himself, and not have them searched for and found?

MR. ONGLEY: Well, I would say, under

those circumstances, sir, that you are quite right except that it is an awful long way to transport your eggs from Vancouver to Toronto, when you already have a market in Vancouver not making use of those eggs or distributing them; that is all. You will note we do not ask the CBC to go into every city or town or anything like that -- except in 5(b). Particularly in Section 4(a)(b) and (c) it is designed to encourage and promote the production of theatre, drama, in the CBC production centres. We have in Toronto and Montreal -- the CBC has a fully established audition department, but here is the CBC conducting and having its centres in Vancouver and Winnipeg and Halifax technically on a par with Toronto and Montreal, and you are not providing the same facilities as Toronto and Montreal, and making it all the more difficult, as a matter of fact, for the producers in those other centres to put on presentations. I am suggesting it should be spread out.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are not suggesting they should go outside their existing framework of activity?

MR. ONGLEY: Exactly, sir -- not outside their existing framework whatsoever. It is to make use to the full of that existing framework.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Except they may need larger studios or they may need studios if they don't have them, to train them and to

do the staging in.

MR. ONGLEY: I am not sure of the requirements in the other areas -- the actual stage facilities, rather. I do know in Vancouver and Winnipeg, for instance, the CBC is carrying programmes, sort of variety -- it is music, but not theatre -- not drama. That is not the same from that point of view. Although, at the same time, in music, if you have an established symphony, you don't require auditions, but you may in such things as ballet and that type of thing where there are singers, and so on. We look only to one standard, and in nothing that we recommend would we want the CBC to vary from that. We are only interested in one thing, and that is quality of presentation. That is a standard, and CBC is interested in that. That is what it wants; that is what was envisaged in the Aird Commission, that it had to be of a standard.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I take it from that that you should not go from Vancouver to Winnipeg for a play merely because it comes from Vancouver or Winnipeg?

MR. ONGLEY: No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: All the desirability of getting it across the country would be to try and get the best possible play?

MR. ONGLEY: That is right, but I think it is certainly in reverse. I wouldn't want it to happen, because we tried it in

Vancouver and it failed once, and if we are going to accept a defeatist attitude it is not worth trying it again, because there have been failures in other centres both in radio and television.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

CANADIAN ASSOCIATION FOR ADULT EDUCATION

Appearances:

| | |
|---|---|
| Dr. J. Roby Kidd | Director |
| Dr. O. E. Ault | Chairman |
| Mrs. Isabel Wilson | National Secretary |
| Mr. Gordon Hawkins | Assistant Director |

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kidd, I take it you are going to present this brief.

MR. KIDD: Right sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Am I right that accompanying you are Dr. Ault, Mrs. Isabel Wilson and Mr. Gordon Hawkins.

MR. KIDD: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will start by marking your brief as Exhibit No. 213.

---EXHIBIT NO. 213: Brief presented by the Canadian Association for Adult Education.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before you begin, Dr. Kidd, I have received some letters about your brief which I think I should read into the record. One is from William F. Macklaier, Q.C. The letter is addressed to our secretary and reads as follows:

"The Secretary,

The Royal Commission on Broadcasting,

220 Wellington Street,

Ottawa, Canada.

"Dear Sir:

I have been informed that the Canadian Association for Adult Education in a brief filed with your Commission has strongly favoured the maintenance of the Broadcasting Corporation's present dual position as both competitor and regulator. I am further informed that I am listed as one of the supporters of the Canadian Association for Adult Education.

Having devoted yesterday to appearing before your Commission to present the brief of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce with my main thesis being opposition to the Broadcasting Corporation's present dual position, and as I am personally strongly in favour of the Canadian Chamber's submission in this regard, I hasten to make it clear that I am not a supporter of the Canadian Association for Adult Education in regard to their submission in this respect. In point of fact my only connection with the Canadian Association for Adult Education is as a very modest annual subscriber to its funds. I have never seen the full text of the Association's brief, had no previous awareness of the stand the Association was taking on this point and certainly do not support or desire to be listed as supporting this stand.

Yours very truly,

W. F. Macklaier"

The second letter is on a slightly different basis. It is from Mr. Donald M. Fleming, M.P., and is addressed to the Secretary:

"The Secretary,
The Royal Commission on Broadcasting,
220 Wellington Street,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir:

I am informed that the Canadian Association for Adult Education has submitted a brief to your Commission, and lists me as one of the supporters of the Association. It is true that I have made a modest financial contribution each year to the support of the Association, but I have not seen the brief in question, nor was I aware that the Association intended to submit a brief to you.

It is evident that the brief has not been submitted to members or supporters at large. I presume it has been prepared on the authority of the Executive, but I do not know.

In view of my position as a Member of Parliament, I wish to dissociate myself entirely from the brief.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) Donald M. Fleming, M.P."

THE CHAIRMAN: Since those are read into the record they do not need to be filed. Now Dr. Kidd, would you care to present this brief. We have read it. You may put in a summarized form if you like.

MR. KIDD: The Canadian Association for Adult Education was organized in 1934 to promote the development and the improvement of adult education in Canada, and to cooperate with similar associations in other countries. Since the association has in its membership business men and women and professional men and women and housewives it is impossible for all of them to have worked on the brief, but this brief is presented on the authority of the executive and the authorization of the national council elected by a policy body. Such matters are subject to the policy of the association and it was followed in this case. This brief was presented on three different occasions and the last time before the Association of Arts, Letters and Sciences.

The CAAE is a national, voluntary organization, with a council of 100 members as its governing body. Institutions and organizations from all parts of Canada are represented on the council and its membership is drawn from a wide range of occupations and interests. The purposes of the association are:-

1. To serve as a clearing house for the adult education movement and to maintain a working library.

2. To develop interest in adult education through publications, conferences, broadcasts, public discussion, films, etc.
3. To suggest methods of promoting, organizing and directing adult learning.
4. To provide for study and research.
5. To undertake experiments and demonstrations.
6. To advise grant-giving bodies, education trusts, and private donors regarding the status of organizations that apply for grants.

We have in our firm, as you must have in yours, a person somewhere in control and we believe that broadcasting must be conducted and regulated in the public interest. We agree with the Aird Commission, and with the Parliament of Canada, that control of the air should be in the hands of parliament exercised through a public corporation. This conception of a public broadcasting system, with local privately-owned stations, has been upheld by parliamentary committees through the years.

We are of the opinion that the CBC staff responsible for maintaining good relations with private stations should not also be in charge of regulating, perhaps for reasons already discussed today.

THE CHAIRMAN: You think these two things are inconsistent? Is that the same point?

MR. KIDD: That is right. And it is the opinion of the association that the CBC has a duty and a responsibility to provide the general public with more information about the national system of broadcasting and its functions.

It is the opinion of the association that the CBC has a duty to provide the general public with more information about the national system and its functioning. We have found that individuals and voluntary organizations have sometimes found it difficult to secure accurate information about Canadian broadcasting policies.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just while you are at that point. It is a small point but it saves coming back to it later. You heard my question put to a previous witness as to the problems of a publicly-owned body, an operating body defined by the Act, juggling its policy. Do you agree with the earlier witness that this ought to be done.

MR. KIDD: There are two points.

-

-

-

There are really two points on this subject of information about broadcasting and I think the CBC has clearly the right and duty to look after this matter. On the point of defining its own policies, I would also agree with the last witness, although it is a more debatable point. Surely, however, on the function of the system itself, the question asked does not apply.

THE CHAIRMAN : No - I don't think it does apply to public information on factual matters; however, the principal itself - not discussing policy - is fairly well defined in our Canadian system.

MR. KIDD : This is a much more difficult matter and my private view is that the CBC should take a vigorous position here.

On the matter of financing, the main point we are making is that this system will cost money; if you want to provide it for the national interest, then we have got to find the money. We are not specifying how much - or how this should be done.

On the matter of programming, where we have devoted most of our attention, the CAC urges that the same kind of attention and the same technical ability and skill should be expended on the production of TV programmes in the field of public affairs, as in the fields of variety and drama.

Much of our concern in this brief has been directed to the kind of programming which may require special preparation and special attention and which should not be judged on standard which may be described as show business. Variety shows ought to be judged on the best variety and public affairs also have to be similarly judged - not necessarily though, by identical standards. Because of the bi-lingual character of our country, our Association believes that the use of both television and radio for teaching purposes should be explored more fully.

We have seen some examples of where this has been started in Britain and the United States where they have made further efforts than have been made in Canada, in this direction, in spite of the obvious need for it here.

We were very much concerned about radio sales now that the big entertainment - the mass audience programmes - are often seen on television. We believe that much could be done on radio for items of special public interest - admittedly a minority, but a very important audience, and we advise an English-speaking counterpart of the French-language Radio College which we feel might well be developed today.

THE CHAIRMAN: You do feel, though, that radio is not, so to speak, a diminishing asset? It is something that must be kept up and maintained. There have been views expressed to us that,

now that television is here, as one man put it, radio was the tail on the television dog, and while a tail may be a nice thing to have, it is not as important as it used to be.

MR. KIDD : The relative importance is always a hard thing to assess. In large areas of Canada still, of course, radio is the most important instrument, linking people with each other and with their government and with their literature and so on. This is an essential matter. We do think that in areas now served by television there are those special purposes which perhaps will have a greater opportunity than in the past, when radio had to carry a large load of the mass audience and didn't have quite the chance for special attention it now has.

This may appear to be a little irrelevant, but in the international affairs field we feel that Canada ought to be making some contribution. The radio is more significant, in our opinion, than television, in areas throughout the world today where there are few newspapers and books and sometimes no television at all. Radio is the only link in these places, by propoganda and ideals and so on, which are being spread every day. This particularly applies in areas where important ideological conflicts are going on. Television is irrelevant here. Canada is going to have to train its people to make a contribution in this respect. As I say it almost sounds irrelevant,

but it seems to me that it does establish at one level at least, the significance of radio in the modern world.

We also raise the question of further research in the field of communications, bearing in mind the progress which has been made extensively in Britain and the United States and in other countries. Some of this, of course, ought to be done in the universities, but it ought to be done with some collaboration between the CBC and the universities. In any event more of this research is going to be needed, particularly as to the benefit of broadcasting to people with children. Of course, it also applies to adults, but it is important by its influence on the formation of attitudes to citizenship and the acceptance of responsibility and so on.

We ought to know more about what happens than perhaps we do.

THE CHAIRMAN : Just on that point of research, I don't want to keep interrupting you but as the individual points come up sometimes it is easier to handle them this way. You say more research is needed -- is there some advantage in having research functions initiated from outside. Is there some advantage in research being a shared operation between private broadcasters and the CBC and the universities and anybody else who is interested. Are you suggesting that the

research should be done by the CBC ?

MR. KIDD : No I am not suggesting that at all. I do feel that this job will have to be shared, particularly in Canada. In the United States most of this research is still reasonably costly and is provided through grants from foundations. It has been done either in association with universities or other institutions. In Canada it seems to me that it will be done through the universities; of course we don't have foundations to support this work. In the case of the United Kingdom there also happen to be some foundations, but not in Canada. It seems to us in Canada we may have to use some tax funds, for the same purpose, to go along with perhaps the general support of the universities. Some of this tax money should be set aside for research in the social sciences here, and at the same time, we should try to find a way of bringing the CBC and the private stations into this partnership without dominating them, or their way of management.

THE CHAIRMAN : When you say substantial sums - what sums are you talking about?

MR. KIDD : Substantial sums for universities. $100,000 goes a long way in this kind of field. As you know, there are many of the social science faculties in universities who have substantial revenues for research, but really you need a couple of extra men. Two extra men

will be able to manage it.

We have heard several opinions about the use of films in relation to broadcasting and we are very much aware of the large body of Canadians not presently served by television but who are served by educational films and more of the excellent fare provided by the CBC and any private stations should be available to this audience, by making available programmes on film or kinescope. We know that this service has been frequently asked for and, we feel this is a way of financing the distribution and use of film material. It seems to us a natural extension of the work of the corporation and one which we ought to arrange to do as quickly as possible.

We also believe that the amount of money spent on such programming will increase the size of the audience and we realize that there are certain problems of production, quality of recording of this film or kinescope - but these are not problems that are unsolvable, in our opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN : Your thought there, and I think it is a new one to us, is that good programmes of the corporation should be put on film and put out on circuit, of the National Film Board ?

MR. KIDD : That's right. There are now many programmes that appear on television which would make excellent fare for these local film viewers,

church audiences and so on, strung all across Canada. Few Canadians realize what a substantial market this is and what large number of people do so film programmes regularly and many of these are presently out of the range of TV. However, even when they are within the range of TV this is a secondary use of really signficant programmes where they can see films in groups and have a chance of talking about them and discussing their implications - where the impact of single programming may be increased over simply seeing them at home.

We of course are experimenting this year in the use of kinescopes prepared originally for citizen's forum, and we feel that in public affairs, where groups of people will see the kinescope and use the special material of other kinds, this will have the effect of penetrating a little more deeply into the areas of international affairs and so on.

We have also made the point, the relevance of which may be questioned, about the need of Canada to do something about its official archives, and quickly. There are priceless records of Canadian achievement and activities being made every day and being used, once, on television, just as the National Film Board are also contributing to this store. There is no means yet in Canada

for selecting and maintaining this record of Canadian life and achievements, in any consistent way, for the use of students and for public record and so on. Now, this is not just a problem for the CBC or for the National Film Board or for the government, or the National Archives, but it is a problem which affects all of us. We are in danger of losing a great deal of material which would be a really priceless possession. I am referring to the fact that at least four films, for instance, one on Sir Wilfrid Laurier, have been made, and not one foot of this film now exists. Now this happened and it should not have happened. It is still happening because we don't have a clear policy yet for the very difficult matter of what to select and where to maintain it and how to give access to it, to the students and scholars and so on.

We feel that no time should be lost - at least no further time - in establishing such a policy, particularly for the creation and building of a new national archives.

THE CHAIRMAN : That is a very interesting point. I think it is getting a bit outside of our terms of reference because this is not, as you know, quite the same, for instance, as the Massey Commission.

MR. KIDD: No - we feel that we should

point out that this is a problem, however, and that the CBC is preparing in Canada more of this material than any other agency.

THE CHAIRMAN : They ought at least to keep their good historical programmes - is that what you say ?

MR. KIDD : Yes. I am saying, at least, I think without fear of denial, that that is not being done by any agency on the kind of basis that I am suggesting. We have made several comments on the conception of broadcasting and, of course, agree that television which has appeal can be entertaining and can amuse and can educate, but we feel that if every programme must be entertaining and satisfying to the mass audience, at the expense of the few, resulting in stereotyped and sloppy broadcasting, then careful attention has to be given to programme planning and to the training of people who understand that and we feel, further, that more attention should be given than now is being given - particularly in the field of public affairs - to programmes which cannot compete for the mass audience although they are very desirable contributions to Canadian development.

We have noted in the field of radio and in the field of the education film that Canada has a unique record. Canada is regarded as a leader in this kind of film -- it is so regarded by Americans

and British and by other peoples, as having made an outstanding contribution in this respect.

THE CHAIRMAN : This is in the realm of the documentary film?

MR. KIDD : All programmes having to do with public affairs, educational films, documentary films and various programmes on radio that have been outstanding as judged against the productions in other countries.

THE CHAIRMAN : And do you also apply it to radio programmes as well as to the documentary film ?

MR. KIDD : That's right. We are not sure that this is happening in TV yet. We think that ways ought to be found so that it will happen. We are not proposing the establishment of educational channels or education stations as in the United States, is the way to do this, but we do think that the direct approach to public affairs programming ought to be made, and we have some ideas about that, if the Commission should wish to discuss this subject further.

THE CHAIRMAN : Just on the subject of public affairs type of programming, has your association had any experience with the degree of this kind of public service that the private stations have provided in Canada, in radio and also in TV. What I am thinking of is this, that there is a great deal to be said perhaps for the difficulty

of private stations producing a very large and expensive spectacular show, but in this field of public information and public debate and forum discussion and like things, it would seem that the cost factor would not be nearly as significant. Have you any figures or experience, at all, in the field of private station performance in this area?

MR. KIDD : We have conducted an experiment with the private station in London, two or three years ago, on a programme of international affairs, where the basic part of the programme was filmed and which we did not produce, but was already available, and that had to be selected. The best people we could find in the area of London also took part in discussing the films and implications and so on, for London and for Canada. The whole cost of this, not counting air time, was in the nature of two or three hundred dollars. We feel that with imagination, the use of films and things of this nature could be done at modest cost.

THE CHAIRMAN : We have heard a great deal about programmes for adults and at least, in some stations, there has been an attempt made to get interviews with visiting people of importance in the field of public affairs. What has been your experience as an association, with adult

education in radio. We are very anxious to know something about, so to speak, programme performance of both the CBC and the private stations, and many people have mentioned the CBC performance in this field. What about the private stations? Have you had much contact with them on this subject - do they do much in this direction?

MR. KIDD : Mrs. Wilson perhaps would like to answer this question.

MRS. WILSON : Well of course our actual activity is in the field of the national programme planning with the two forums with which we are most closely associated -- that is to say, Citizens Forum and the National Farm Forum. Our association has been with the CBC in connection with these two because they are national and not local you see.

MR. KIDD : Of course they are aired on the private stations.

MRS. WILSON : Oh yes - they have been on the networks.

THE CHAIRMAN : Yes -- that is a network operation.

MRS. WILSON: The programming plan aspect of it has been national, so the private stations have carried them. For the most part our connection in the planning has been with the CBC.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does your Association have local branches or are you a central organization?

MR. KIDD: Our local arrangements are usually through the extension departments of the universities or the division of adult education, but we really do not have branches.

THE CHAIRMAN: But you have indicated that this type of programme went to the CBC?

MR. KIDD: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have not attempted to go to the private stations except in the one case you mentioned in London?

MR. KIDD: Yes, we do feel on the basis of that and the Association we know that carried on with university extension that more of this can be done. There are no private station radio forums in Vancouver; in Montreal there has been extensive work done and at the Antigonish station.

THE CHAIRMAN: The purpose of my question is, and I think there many bits of evidence which tend to criticize the private stations for not doing more in the field of public affairs -- it may be that the people who are primarily interested in the public affairs have not worked too hard at helping with the private stations?

MR. KIDD: I think you are quite right about that. I want to say that any time we have approached a private station about matters of this kind we have been received well.

MRS. WILSON: We as a national association do not plan the local programmes except in the odd case.

THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, of course, but it may be that local people interested in this field are not doing enough in this direction.

MR. KIDD: Yes, and of course all the people we have contacted in connection with universities have different workshops in different centres where the upshot of the two or three day conference was to encourage local people, like the university or the chamber of commerce or the farmers' organizations, to work with the private stations to support the station to actually get into programming with them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does that pretty well outline your brief?

MR. KIDD: Yes.

MR. COYNE: I just have one or two questions. First of all, on the question of control of broadcasting in which you advocate a continuation of the present system, you say on page 4, the middle of the page, commenting on this proposal of the independent board which has been made to us:

"The creation of an independent board would imply that there are two

separate systems to be regulated and governed. It is the conviction of the Association that, in the process of time, the rulings of such an independent board might make it impossible for the CBC to provide national network broadcasting in the interests of the people of Canada."

The proposition I would like to put to you is this, if one assumes an independent board charged with regulation and control of broadcasting generally in Canada in the public interest, and assuming that they are not derelict in their duties to uphold and support the public interest, why are you convinced that the rulings of such a board might make it impossible for the CBC to provide national network broadcasting except in the very unlikely event that it was not considered to be in the public interest that they should continue? Would you comment on that?

MR. KIDD: Yes. I often wonder whether a hypothetical question like that should be introduced into such a brief because it is always difficult to support it. When this was first introduced, and it was on two or three occasions, that those who have worked in this way have been impressed, perhaps wrongly, by the experience in the United States where they feel that even with the protection of the FCC that the Federal Communications Commission did not provide sufficient protection for the public

interest in broadcasting and that there seemed to be a great deal of concern for the public interest there. Now, those who have argued this way may have been unduly influenced by what they saw there and have applied to Canada. That is how this argument has been developed here.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: What do you mean by the public interest, the nature of certain programmes?

MR. KIDD: Yes, that radio in the country was more and more being planned in the interests, I say, of one industry, the advertising industry rather than in the interests of the country as a whole.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Yes, but on the other hand Mr. Fowler the other day, more or less on the same subject, read into the record the fact that CBS, the Columbia Broadcasting System, spent in 1955, I think it was over, somewhere between seven million dollars or ten million dollars for the dissemination of what might be called serious programmes, programmes that would be unreadily sponsored, or, if you want to use the word, cultural programmes. On that basis, it is a substantial sum, and must represent a substantial number of hours a month being used by a private system.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is your point here in the sentence that Mr. Coyne read to you, that you are afraid in effect that an independent board might become something very similar to

the FCC and nothing more?

MR. KIDD: That is certainly the fear which is expressed here, and it was the examination -- I should have pointed out that a rather lengthy examination on broadcasting in the United States, in Canada, Australia and Great Britain was carried on just before the Massey Commission, and those who took part in that reached the conclusion that a board in Canada might operate the way of the FCC in the United States. They may have been right or wrong about that but that is the conclusion they reached.

THE CHAIRMAN: At any rate, your Association does not want that kind of thing?

MR. KIDD: Right.

MR. COYNE: I suppose one could say it all depends on the planning board. For instance, we might appoint a board and just say, "Go ahead and run the broadcasting in the public interest" and they would then determine this in all particulars, what was the public interest. On the other hand, I am just posing these suggestions for what they are worth, but in the alternative we might have a board for whom a declaration of what the public interest, in broad terms, was, which they were supposed to apply. Would it make any difference in your mind as to the possible result if different constituents of a board were considered along thoselines?

MR. KIDD: I suppose it is difficult on predicting themakeup of the board and what might happen, which is the problem here.

Actually, this is not the kind of prediction I would want to put in because I just cannot forecast what its nature would be and what pressures it would be under, and what the outcome might be. But those who did study this reached the conclusion that the net effect of operating in the way proposed would be the whittling away of the concern about the interest of the whole of the people and having this replaced by those whose primary concern was the single aspect of broadcasting or something like that.

MR. COYNE: Would it be fair, then, to put it this way: the ceiling was based upon a general suggestion that the system as it is now constructed and as it now operates with a certain concern about the unknown which some change in the system might lead to?

MR. KIDD: Well, that is certainly fair as far as the experience of those who framed this, because they did not see any serious disabilities with the present situation.

MR. COYNE: Well then, just turning to your section on finances, I have one question. You comment on the bottom of page 6 in general terms as to the alternative methods of financing and you say:

> "The income from the tax on the sale of receiving sets is predictable. In a series of surveys in the United States the buying habits

> of the public have been well established, and it is known with a large measure of certainty, the sums that can be expected from this source over a period of years. With these considerations in mind, the Association is convinced that the contribution of the Government is the only flexible factor."

I think it is generally admitted that the excise tax does not seem to generate sufficient income to provide the type of service that certain people are advocating. Assuming that some additional revenue is required or justified, is there any objection in your mind to the excise tax as such, as a contributor to be made payable to the CBC?

MR. KIDD: As far as this has been considered in the Association there has been no objection raised but it would not provide enough.

MR. COYNE: Then, on the question of the use of films, where you speak on page 8 of this large and significant audience for non-theatrical films that has been built up in Canada and the desirability of distributing worthwhile television films or kinescopes, is there any possibility of any revenue being derived from such distribution? Is there any need that such distribution be made by CBC or any other agency concerned?

MR. KIDD: There is a modest revenue. I indicated that film councils are already buying films; these are not being provided for them free,

they are buying them. This would alsobe true, I expect, that not only is there the bare cost of film but the amortization of the cost of production.

MR. COYNE: Therefore, it may be possible to conceive of some modest revenue being derived from films of that kind?

MR. KIDD: That is right.

MR. COYNE: Then, turning to page 11, you are speaking of the function of the mass media and your concern about the influence of show business as a factor in the production of the more serious or educational types of programmes. Are you giving us here merely a general caution which a broadcast-producing organization should keep in mind, or is there any way in which the type of balance you are speaking of can be assured? Let me put it this way: I have in mind the proposition that has been put to us before that education needs to be sold; if you can dress it up in some more attractive package you are perhaps more likely to interest a larger audience in the principal message.

MR. KIDD: Yes, with that contention I would not disagree. The necessity, though, for having producers of great or real capacity to look to this kind of programme as a primary interest, that is, an interest if it is to be taken at all -- television naturally attracts people who are interested in show business, in the presentation, and at the beginning it attracts people who are interested in techniques

and gadgets. If we are to have the best kind of programmes these men need to be well educated men who know how to give effective consideration to ideas. I think it is the responsibility, not only of the CBC, I think it is in large measure the responsibility of some universities to share in the finding and training of these men.

MR. COYNE: You refer a little further down the page to Vision Magazine; where is it published?

MR. KIDD: A Canadian magazine published in Toronto.

MR. COYNE: What is it, briefly?

MR. KIDD: It is a magazine about television and the motion picture.

MR. COYNE: Published by a trade group?

MR. KIDD: Reg C. Wilson.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not an Association house organ?

MR. KIDD: No, it is a television, motion picture magazine.

MR. COYNE: One final question; on page 12 where you are speaking of the problem of programme balance you say:

> "Many Canadians have felt that such fields as drama, music, public affairs, literature, were reasonably well cared for on radio. But, there was more than one radio network and considerable variety in the choices offered by local

stations. Not so in television. At present, with only one Canadian channel, there is keen competition for the peak viewing hours,"

May I take it from that that you are not in favour of what is known as the single channel policy which presently applies with regard to licensing of television stations?

MR. KIDD: I am assuming at some stage we will get beyond that, and when we do there will be more opportunity in the peak, choice hours for choice in fare.

MR. COYNE: In the final sentence of your brief you say, "Precisely in the subjects where the CBC radio networks and the National Film Board have enjoyed their most notable achievements that we feel other countries are making as much or greater progress than is Canadian television." Might it be assumed that one reason why this progress in Canada has not been as great as we would have wished has been the fact of this shortage of broadcasting time and the necessity of CBC to serve such a broad range of tastes with a very limited distribution available?

MR. KIDD: And of the necessity of earning its way and getting some revenue from the programmes, particularly between 8 and 10 in the evening.

MR. COYNE: And if the single channel policy was abandoned do you think that would result in an improvement?

MR. KIDD: It would allow for more opportunity for the kind of programmes we are interested in. The inevitable improvement -- I don't think improvement is inevitable. I think the opportunity would be there.

MR. COYNE: Yes, that is a much better way of putting it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Dr. Kidd, I would like to thank you and your associates for preparing this brief and presenting it to us. We are very interested

in it and we will consider it.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have one other short brief that we will hear tonight if everyone is agreeable, that of the Ottawa Council of Churches. I may say that the brief that was down for today, the Association of Radio and Television Employees of Canada, we have put over until tomorrow because of the lateness of the hour and because of the interesting talks we had with some of the earlier witnesses which kept us later than expected.

## OTTAWA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Appearances:

Rev. Lorne Lemoine

Rev. W.A. Beecroft

Rev. W.H. Bradley

- - - - -

THE CHAIRMAN: If you gentlemen on this next brief will come forward and present it now, because we don't want to hold you over for another day; you have waited very patiently for us tonight. We will begin by marking your brief as Exhibit No. 214.

---EXHIBIT NO. 214: Brief of Ottawa Council of Churches.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, Bishop Reed is unable to be with us. Dr. Beecroft is on my right, and the Rev. Lemoine is next to him, and my name is W.H. Bradley.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bradley, as this brief is just one page, perhaps it would be easier for you to read it through.

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The purpose of this brief is to set before the Royal Commission on broadcasting, certain facts in regard to the broadcasting of the regular services of the churches of Ottawa, facts that will bring out that the churches of Ottawa are not being served adequately either by CBO or the privately owned stations.

In Ottawa there are three English language radio stations, CBO is the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation local outlet and CKOY and CFRA are privately-owned stations. It is the policy of CBC to leave the broadcasting of local church services to the privately-owned stations of the locality.

In Ottawa the privately-owned stations carry the regular services of three different congregations out of three different denominations through the year.

All the other congregations of these three denominations and all the other denominations have not been able to negotiate with the privately-owned stations for the broadcasting of their church services.

In Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg, CBC for a particular reason, has altered its policy and does broadcast the services of several churches to the great benefit of thousands. The request of the

Ottawa Council of Churches is that in Ottawa, as well as in these other cities, CBC make another exception to its general policy and itself undertake the broadcasting of their regular morning services for other Ottawa churches. This would correct a disability from which many churches in Ottawa are now suffering.

The Ottawa Council of Churches would also point out, that certain popular American telecast programmes of a religious or semi-religious character are carried by CBC TV and piped into Ottawa homes, while the churches and ministers of the local community who year after year help to carry the burden of the neighbourhood and the homeland are denied the opportunities of a radio ministry.

The radio is a wonderful means of mass communication and the church has the greatest message in the world to communicate.

The Ottawa Council of Churches which represents a church community of over 100,000 people respectfully requests the Royal Commission on broadcasting to consider the inadequate facilities provided for the broadcasting of the regular services of the churches of Ottawa and recommend to CBC that it institute some new policy that would provide a more inclusive coverage for the churches of Ottawa.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mr. Bradley, I am sure you will realize that, first of all, this is a very specialized and particular point, and I

think there is some doubt as to whether it falls within our terms of reference -- as to just where it fits, if it does. It is more particularly a matter of management, internal policy of the CBC, rather than any of the rather special financial and particular problems that we have been asked to cover. So, with that qualification, we have been very glad to have your brief. I do have a couple of questions to ask. Do you happen to know what the particular reason is in Toronto, Montreal and Winnipeg that leads to this exception to the regular CBC policy in not broadcasting local churches?

MR. BRADLEY: I believe it was due to contracts that had been previously made in those cities before the CBC took over, when it originally was organized. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to ask if the opportunity could be given to my two colleagues to just make a statement or two before the Commission.

THE CHAIRMAN: We would be very glad to have them do so.

MR. BEECROFT: Mr. Chairman, very briefly; Mr. Bradley answered that question rather quickly. CBC took over stations in Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg some years ago and found certain contracts and felt honour-bound to maintain those contracts down through the years.

In the second paragraph there is a very brief point I would like to make. "It is the policy of CBC to leave the broadcasting of local church services to the privately-owned stations of the locality." As far as the Ottawa Council of

Churches knows, the private stations are not committed to any responsibility in this matter.

Then, the third short paragraph, just one sentence: "In Ottawa the privately-owned stations carry the regular service of three different congregations out of three different denominations through the year" -- on a commercial basis.

THE CHAIRMAN: In other words, this is time that is purchased by these congregations from the private stations?

MR. BEECROFT: That is right. The next brief paragraph: "All other congregations of these three denominations and all the other denominations have not been able to negotiate with the privately-owned stations for the broadcasting of their church services." Maybe that is saying a bit too much. A good many congregations, denominations, have not been able to negotiate, and that is true. The Ottawa Council of Churches makes no complaint about this arrangement that the privately-owned station has with certain congregations. We make no claim; it is none of our business. It is the business of the privately-owned station, and we are on the outside.

THE CHAIRMAN: May I ask a question on the paragraph you just read where you say that other congregations have not been able to negotiate with the privately-owned stations for the broadcasting of their church services: do you mean by that that in some cases, at least, attempts have been made to

negotiate on a commercial basis for the broadcast, or are you complaining, in fact, that these are not carried as a public service?

MR. BEECROFT: I have made an approach, myself, to one of the stations, and I was not able to get to first base.

THE CHAIRMAN: Did you approach them to get time as a public service, or to buy time?

MR. BEECROFT: To buy time. I never dreamed of the other. In the next paragraph, paragraph 5, that has been clarified. "The request of the Ottawa Council of Churches is that in Ottawa, as well as in these other cities, CBC make another exception to its general policy and itself undertake the broadcasting of their regular morning services for other Ottawa churches." We made this interesting discovery, that in former years CBO did carry regular church services in Ottawa. I don't know why it was discontinued. All we are asking is that the services given in former years be renewed, the same as services in Toronto, Montreal and Winnipeg.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Are you thinking only of Sunday broadcasts, or also during the week, when you speak of the broadcasts throughout the brief?

MR. BEECROFT: We are concerned about the broadcasts of the Sunday morning services. That is all we are concerned about -- our regular Sunday morning service which is the best broadcast they can do.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: What time does CBO go on the air in Ottawa? Is it very early or rather late?

MR. BEECROFT: I think quite early; 8 o'clock or half past 8.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are talking now of radio?

MR. BEECROFT: Radio, yes. In the next paragraph, paragraph 6, we speak about imports of outstanding broadcasts from New York and other places. "...while the churches and ministers of the local community who year after year help to carry the burden of the neighbourhood and the homeland are denied the opportunities of a radio ministry." The Ottawa Council of Churches feels that the ministry of the local clergy and the service of the local congregation is an important thing for Ottawa, and their ministry means more to the Ottawa locality than anything that comes from New York, because Ottawa knows these men.

THE CHAIRMAN: You are talking, probably, about the Bishop Sheen programme, are you not, there?

MR. BEECROFT: Well, I would not like to pick on any one in particular. It is not the only one that comes from far away places.

THE CHAIRMAN: Because I think it is a sponsored programme. It is sponsored in a very special way, but we have heard something about this in Toronto.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The National Religious Council. Do these programmes that come in from New York come into Ottawa at the time at which you would wish to broadcast or are they at some off period?

MR. BEECROFT: I don't think they would clash with our 11 o'clock service.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: The point I was trying to get at was whether or not those others come in in some off period when time is available as against the specific time you would wish to have.

MR. BEECROFT: We made no complaint about that, about the importation of these excellent programmes, but if CBC is willing to carry them we feel they should be willing to carry the local church services which are of more consequence to the local community than anything that comes from far-away places.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: Are they coming in live, or are they recorded programmes? Do they come in live from churches in the United States?

MR. BEECROFT: I am afraid I am not competent to answer that. I doubt if they come in live. I think they are picked up somewhere by kinescope.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think they are on tape.

MR. BEECROFT: I think so. The next paragraph: "The radio is a wonderful means of mass communication and the church has the greatest message in the world to communicate." You will forgive the Ottawa Council of Churches for stating

that so strongly.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't think you will find any questions on that score.

MR. BEECROFT: We feel it is much more basic to our civilization and our hope for the future than any message from any other source. We feel CBC should carry that great message. I have no comment on the eighth paragraph. We talk about 100,000 people, and I have the 1955 census figures here which pretty well proximate 100,000.

There are two other remarks I would like to make, Mr. Chairman. We know what CBC will tell us. They will say CBO is a network station and not supposed to carry local broadcasts. Well, so is the station in Montreal, and it carries local; so is the station in Toronto. I think I am right in saying that CBO is carrying a good many local broadcasts. I know it is going to do a lot of work for the Community Chest in a few weeks, and if I am not mistaken it has a local sports broadcaster. I mean, we have a football team in Ottawa, and its news --

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't know how far we will let you go on with these plugs. (Laughter)

MR. BEECROFT: Well, I don't hear any more the Toronto gravel-voiced sports broadcaster; however, I hear somebody from Ottawa broadcasting sports. Maybe I am mistaken about this, but I think CBO does a good deal of local broadcasting.

COMMISSIONER STEWART: Would the Council of Churches object to a delayed broadcast? Because, after all, you want a particular period of the day, and there are only a certain number of hours in a day. Would the Council of Churches object to, say, a delayed broadcast coming on at 3 o'clock or 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon rather than coming on at 11 o'clock when the service is actually in effect?

MR. BEECROFT: Don't ask me what the Council of Churches might object to. They have objected to things -- I can't answer that question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is the objective that you have, then, to get these programmes on live at 11 a.m.?

MR. BEECROFT: That is it.

THE CHAIRMAN: On Sunday morning?

MR. BEECROFT: That is it.

THE CHAIRMAN: But supposing for some good, practical reasons 11 a.m. is filled up with something else on CBO that may be a contract commitment; Mr. Stewart's question is, could this programme be put on tape and used as a religious broadcast later?

MR. BEECROFT: I think it would be very acceptable to the Ottawa Council of Churches. The only other point, Mr. Chairman, is, the Ottawa Council of Churches asks for one hour a week from CBC -- that hour, 11 a.m. Sunday. There is a beautiful programme of music on at that time, but we feel there are many other times during the day

when the community would listen to music, and let that one hour be the church's hour. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lemoine, have you anything to add?

MR. LEMOINE: Mr. Chairman, the subject has been very well covered by the two previous speakers. I might just make the one comment, that at the present time it is my privilege to be the radio convenor for the Ottawa Council of Churches, and in that capacity I draw up the schedules for the weekday religious broadcasts over CBO. CBO does carry religious broadcasts during the weekdays from 8.15 to 8.30 a.m., and all the unions of our Council share in this work. From the letters which the ministers who have participated in this receive from time to time, and from comments which come to us, we understand there are many people who receive a great deal of comfort and inspiration from these morning broadcasts and people say, too, it means a great deal to them to hear the voices of their own ministers on the radio from time to time, and it seems to us in the Ottawa Council that if CBO could carry over its weekday policy to Sunday it would give some of those people, especially shut-ins and others who are unable to get about, an opportunity to hear the voices of their own ministers in their own churches on Sunday, and it may in some degree rectify the injustice of the present system which causes several communions and congregations to be

excluded from the air. We hope our appearance here today will be a step leading to this desirable result.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do any of you happen to know why it is that CBC is prepared to carry religious broadcasts every morning of the week but not on Sunday? Is it by any chance that they have an overall programme balance to establish and they feel the total number of hours in the weeks and months of broadcasting fare is all that they can devote with the many other claims that are made upon them? Is this part of programme balancing, or is there something special or peculiar between weekdays and Sundays? Do you know the basis of this ruling.

COMMISSIONER TURCOTTE: You say in your brief there are two other stations, CKOY and CFRA giving three different congregations regular services out of their different denominations: wouldn't it be that these religious services are being held exactly at that hour, and if CBC also gave religious services to citizens of Ottawa for the period of one hour, you would have no choice but religious programmes no matter what stations they turned to, and that the CBC in its desire to give varied fare to the citizens of Ottawa says, well, there are two other stations at that time who have religious programmes on the air, and we will put on a programme of music. I don't know, but I suspect that is probably the reason. Otherwise, for a period of two hours on Sunday morning there would be nothing but religious services -- which is something acceptable

in itself -- but there is no freedom of choice in this case about which we have heard so much. Might that not be the explanation?

MR. BRADLEY: I have the impression, sir, that that has perhaps nothing to do with the CBC's policy in this matter, that a by-law was made at one time whereby the CBC would not carry religious broadcasts on a regular basis from 11 to 12 in the morning except in those communities before the by-law was passed; those communities are Winnipeg, Montreal and Toronto. In those three communities CBC carries a Sunday morning broadcast from 11 to 12 and also the weekday broadcasts.

THE CHAIRMAN: My suggestion is not right, then. Well, gentlemen, we are very sorry to have kept you as long as we did, but it was the best we could do.

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will start at 9.30 tomorrow morning.

---The hearing adjourned at 6 p.m. until 9.30 a.m.

HAND BOUND
BY
UNIVERSITY
OF TORONTO
PRESS